Library of
Southwestern College

THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION

Volume IX NOVEMBER 1923 Number 4

OUR HIDDEN AIMS*

HERBERT A. WICHELNS
University of Pittsburgh

PRESIDENT BUTLER of Columbia remarks in one of his published papers that it is very hard to get college teachers to interest themselves in education. It is not difficult to see why this is the case. Control of the curriculum has passed from the teachers to the administrators. Charles Eliot, with his elective system, has become the Frankenstein of education, and the attempt to reshape college education has left it shapeless. It is hard to maintain one's interest in a chaos one is powerless to alter; no wonder college teachers are not interested in education, and so take refuge in glorifying their own specialties. But if it is easy to see how the present situation has arisen, it is equally easy to see why this situation ought not to continue.

The reason was laid down long ago by Euclid: the whole is greater than the part. On the general aim of the liberal college depends not only the organization of the curriculum, but the nature and method of single courses. That general aim has often been hidden; at one time—in the hey-day of specialization—may have been completely lost from sight, but is now beginning to be recognized again. An instance in our own field is the fact that the long dis-

* Read at the last session of the Seventh Convention, N. A. T. S., December 29, 1922.

cussion of the fundamental course has now given place to the question of content, which carries us definitely into general educational theory. An instance in the broader field of educational practice is the attempt at Amherst and at some other colleges to make once more the whole curriculum, rather than the single course, the chief object of educational thought. If our hidden aims have not yet ventured into the light of day, at least they show themselves in the half-light of daybreak. Our hidden aims are the aims of education generally. In this paper I hope to show the need of considering them if we are to make our work in a liberal college what it should be. Perhaps the same doctrine will apply to other types of institution than the liberal college, but that is not for me to say.

It has been said, and with justice, "It is tiresome to educate; it is tiresome to be educated; it is tiresome to discuss education." It is only because several of the established problems of teachers of public speaking seem to point for their solution to considerations of a general nature, that I venture to think this a good time to be tiresome on the subject of education.

One of our established problems is concerned with the standing of teachers of public speaking and allied subjects. Another has to do with the quality and purpose of the men now entering the profession. A third is the value and direction of research. A fourth concerns itself with content, either as a teaching device or as a means of justification to our colleagues. On all these problems one could shed light by first asking important general questions: What should our courses do to students? What is the peculiar function of our courses in the curriculum? I think most of us have a notion of what our principal courses should do to the student. But we take the student very much by and large, and as one who, comet-like, comes to us from the void. We do not think of the undergraduate as one who is subjected, in the classroom next to ours and in the period right after our own, to influences which we must take into account if we are to teach effectively and if we are to understand our own excuse for being.

That we have not paid much regard to the total drift of the curriculum is the more strange because in such fields as debate we have been conscious that other activities existed, affecting the problem, setting a precedent good or bad, establishing a student psychology that we have had to modify or else use as we could. But

in teaching we do not seem so willing to consider how other factors, other departments, condition our own activity. Those who question this statement may well ask themselves how many suggestions they have read—in the JOURNAL or elsewhere—on adapting our courses to the prior training of our students.

It will be thought at once that this statement is belied by an editorial on content and by Mr. Sandford's article in the JOURNAL for November, 1922, as well as by various editorials in a number of JOURNALS, by a quantity of allusions in other articles, by the whole temper of the profession. We do compare our work to that of our colleagues; invidious distinctions force us to it, it will be said. And we rightly declare our courses to be as valuable as any in the curriculum. But it is not defiance, not competition, not the challenge to comparison with English courses or any other, that I have in mind in speaking of the relation of courses in public speaking to the curriculum. Nor have I in mind that type of coöperation between our courses and others described by Mr. Sandford in his recent article.

What I mean can best be put by referring to a book—not very good, not very well known—called the *American College*.[1] This is a collection of essays, each of which tries to explain the place of some study or group of studies in the curriculum. Language and literature, the natural sciences, those newer humanities the social sciences,—each group presents its justification for taking a place in the course of study. One cannot say that to each study is assigned its place and value, because the attempt at synthesis does not go so far as to articulate the various subjects. The particular attempt in the volume named, perhaps, is not very successful; yet it is a valiant effort at synthesis, however incomplete.

No mention is made in that book of our department. But suppose some one were to make a new book, setting forth in full detail the place of every department in the liberal arts curriculum, justifying not only the subject but the method of instruction—in such a work, what should be said of our courses in public speaking? Suppose such a book were to be made by collecting already published papers from different hands? What essays have we which set forth in a general and uncontroversial light the function of our courses?

[1] A compilation of papers read at an Allegheny College Anniversary Conference. (Holt, 1915.)

Whosoever might attempt this task would be compelled to answer first another question: What is the general aim of a liberal arts curriculum? The extreme followers of Charles Eliot, of course, will think this a fool's question, which wise men need not trouble to answer. There are, indeed, various ways of avoiding the problem of the general aim of a college education. It is, for example, gravely dodged by a friend of mine who thinks that such general questions lead men to shirk their own jobs while they strive to reconstruct the educational cosmos. My friend lays more emphasis on the second part of Carlyle's 'Find thy work and do it!' than on the first. Others whom I know exhibit a little more sympathy, and then run to cover behind the elective system. This, they say, makes articulation impossible, and so removes the need of any general aim. Still others feel that the general aim is felt rather than expressed, a matter of attitude rather than of doctrine; this is the position of those who have lived and labored long in academic fields. Yet it seems to me easy to bring back each of these fugitives to the inevitable question. The quoter of Carlyle must be asked how we shall know our work. The pleader of the elective system may be reminded that this, being a human institution, may be questioned, indeed is being questioned rigorously. The ripe scholar, who pleads that the accepted attitudes of education are truisms, better left unsaid, may be reminded that the business of teaching is to keep truisms alive and fruitful for each new academic generation of student and younger teacher.

There is one other way of dodging any general consideration of educational purpose; it is to say that a rounded view of the educational process is the business of specialists in educational theory, of the department of education. In practice these specialists often lay their greatest emphasis on high school administration or on classroom psychology. But even if the department of education does carefully develop a conspectus of the college process, even if it proves itself worthy of the trust reposed in it and so becomes an efficient general staff of the professorial army—is not this a bit too Prussian for our taste? Are we willing to leave interpretations of our ultimate purposes to others, and to content ourselves with the assurance that all we need as teachers is technical knowledge of our subject? No, we ourselves need some tincture of educational philosophy. We need it, clearly, in mapping out the order and gradation of courses in our own department, and in explaining our

work to those colleagues who may not understand it. We need it, also, in the daily round of class-room work and in planning the details of courses. Control of the number and variety of courses which a student may elect—the latest reaction to the old elective system—will not alone restore unity to the curriculum. Unity will be restored chiefly by *shaping each single course in detail under the guidance of a general conception of the purpose of education.*

This statement will not be accepted by those who feel that, once a general subject such as chemistry or public speaking has been accepted in the curriculum, no problem remains but to teach chemistry or public speaking as such. Those who are specialists by nature—laboratory specialists, literary specialists, economic specialists—will philosophize on education only until they get their subjects admitted into the educational scheme; then they are off upon their hobby-horses.

Thus, we are told by specialists in our own field that the business of teachers of public speaking is to teach public speaking. This is so evident that no one ever denied it. (Those who feel the need of saying it, then, as did Professor O'Neill in his article in the JOURNAL for last February, must wish to convey by it some shade of meaning, some attitude of mind, that may be worth investigation at some other time.) We are not to impart knowledge of other subjects such as economics or philosophy, says Mr. O'Neill (pp. 30 and 33 of the JOURNAL just cited), nor are we to try to give the whole of a liberal education in our own department. I agree. But I do not agree with Mr. O'Neill's attempt to separate the ultimate purpose of education sharply from the immediate and prime objective of a group of courses such as given by any one department. (*Op. cit.*, p. 29.) Rather, I should wish to have every single course reflect constantly the total purpose of the institution in which it is given.

Let us be warned against being off on our own hobby-horse. We can contribute to the cause of liberal education something more than teaching a subject that belongs in the curriculum. We can teach it with regard to what students have done and are doing in their other studies, and with regard to the general purpose of a liberal education. If we do so, we shall be unable ever to set aside consideration of the ultimate objective of education. Prior to 1923, I recollect only one article in the JOURNAL that seemed to have the

grand strategy of education in mind. (This was by Professor Newcomb in the JOURNAL for January, 1917.) Here is an aspect of our field that seems to have been neglected: the ways and means of informing our work with the spirit of the educational purpose we serve.

It is to be regretted that this aspect of our problem has been neglected. I take it that teachers are at all times concerned with the ultimate purpose of education, and I should be prepared to find that many of our disputes are caused by failure to refer to the common goal of education. Now it is obvious that an association of specialists have their technical interests which ought to receive most of their attention in conventions and in publications. But is it not equally evident that the general purpose of any organization must control its various functions? The organization which ought to be the primary unit of our thought is the college; the department, even though it be our own department, is but one function of a larger unit. Often it seems as if faculty men think of their own departments, their own bailiwicks in the field of knowledge, as independent little states, with such rights of self-determination as can be won from the great powers of education. But whether they are conscious of the fact or not, teachers do not live unto themselves alone; they cannot avoid some general view of education. The bent of your research, the cast of your teaching, the whole tenor of your academic life, is inevitably conditioned by what you think—or don't think—about the purpose of the academy which you grace with your labors. Thus it is an utter impossibility to grant any specialty the right of self-determination. Every teacher, no matter how sharply limited his province, teaches in the light—or in the shadow—of the general doctrine of education that he holds; just as every scholar conducts his researches in the light—or in the shadow—of his general doctrine of knowledge, whether he hold that doctrine consciously or unconsciously.

My thesis, then, is that a recognition of our general educational philosophy not only will help us do our part in the administration of the curriculum, but will be a necessity if we are to do our best work in our own field. We have often enough observed that most arguments either vanish when the tacit assumptions of both parties are revealed, or else are transformed into new differences—more important because more deeply rooted. There is not one among us but would take a student to task who could not show how a part of

a projected speech bears on its central idea and ultimate purpose. Unless we can show how single courses and separate departments fit into the curriculum, we open ourselves to a similar reproach. As physicians of a sort, we are called upon to mend ourselves. Each September sees us, the charioteers of learning, taking up the reins again and summoning our students to their journey. But do we ever name the journey's end? Day by day we call the stations: weekly quiz, mid-term examination, term report, end of freshman course—change here to sophomore course—commencement day. Commencement day! We announce the goal we have reached by changing the subject to the next trip. Of course, this is an indictment not of teachers of public speaking only, but of the professorial tribe generally. President McCracken of Lafayette tells us that a trustee of the University of Pennsylvania once conferred with various faculty groups on the curriculum, and reported that the faculty had never clearly visualized the type of man and mind they were trying to produce. This was not an isolated instance.

It is not in the plan of this paper to try to reveal our hidden aims, but to ask for their consideration. I fancy that when they have been discussed, it will appear that agreement is more general than has been supposed possible. For after all there seem to be but three types of mind that a college can undertake to produce. It can decide to produce the scientific type of mind, which looks upon the world as an elaborate problem to be solved by the human intellect, and which takes its pleasure in inventing and applying methods. It can decide to produce the materialist type, for which the problem is success in the ordinary sense, and which the college produces by a smattering of vocational courses and large emphasis on the value of student activities. It can decide, finally, to produce a type for which I can find no better word than idealist. Men of this type will appreciate rigorous thinking because they are capable of it; they will have sufficient general soundness to win a measure of success; but they are characterized by sensitiveness to values of the moral and spiritual sort, by a sense of history, and even more by a sense of the wholeness of life, of its complex unity. I would suggest that the friends of specialization in education have at the back of their mind a combination of the first two types: winners of success by application of method. And those who attack specialism, who do not hold courses and departments sacred, who feel that the usual college curriculum is incoherent and disunified, these have at

the back of their mind a belief in the unity of the human spirit, and consequently a belief in the unity of knowledge and of education.

But I am entering upon a discussion to which I wished only to invite you. It is necessary, however, to suggest how the ultimate questions may help us in our business as teachers of public speaking. How will it affect the standing of the profession for us to consider the general educational situation as educators first and as teachers of public speaking second? A friend of mine, a teacher of our subject, seems to have stunned some new colleagues of his—men in other departments—by being able to discuss things that are clearly outside the pale of his department and lying in the field of general ideas. To be at home in the world of ideas can do us no harm, and to be at home with educational ideas may strengthen our hands in times of controversy.

Will it drive desirable men from our ranks to exhibit some knowledge of the grand strategy of education; to be able to show them why the subject we invite them to teach comes where it does in undergraduate experience? We know that the cleverer of our undergraduates raise the question of the meaning of education sooner or later; surely our graduate students should. If they ask, 'What is education all about?' and if they then proceed with the ramifications of that question, how shall we give them an answer? By referring to two of the points of view I mentioned a little while ago, we have an approach to a solution. We can say, with the specialists, 'Man is a problem-solving animal, and your problem as a teacher will be to impart a technique—one of the many techniques—that men need in hunting success. Or you can say, with the humanists, 'Man is also a spirit,' and draw the implications of that statement. One of the important implications is that—to use the words of the president of Amherst—we do not teach so much by what we say, as by the way we think.

Will a consciously-held educational purpose help us with the problem of knowledge versus skill, content versus form? It is the specialists as represented in Mr. O'Neill's paper (already referred to) who make the separation absolute, who speak of teaching how, as if the how were really separable from the what. It is the others, whose starting-point is a view of the spiritual nature of human life, who feel that such separations are arbitrary and temporary: administrative rather than essential. It is these who are not content to help a man say whatever he wants to say, because they know

that thus they approve and confirm the beliefs he utters. They recall the reaction of the word on thought, they know that what we say or hear often enough, we tend to accept. They know, too, that a condition of effective utterance is seriousness, sincerity, active realization of meanings. And thus they come to feel that control of subject-matter may well be conscious rather than unconscious, because it affects not only the types and forms of speaking in which we are technically and immediately interested, but also the development of personality, which is the ultimate goal of teaching.

For those who start from the concept of the unity of the human spirit, no enduring separation of method and content is possible. The greatest writers on style have recognized this. Is it significant, perhaps, that the phrase generally held to sum up the matter of style or method, was given us by a great French naturalist, a scientist in the days when science had not yet left the shelter of the humanistic spirit? 'Style is the man himself.' Nor is it an accident that the brilliant essay on style which goes by the name of Longinus, places, as the first requirement of a great style, grandeur of thought? How are we to maintain a permanent separation of matter and form in the light of these utterances?

What are the results of a separation of form and content? The technicians, the specialists, who would teach method as subject-in-itself, ought to be prepared to conduct classes in oral reading by the use of Robert Service and Walt Mason as readily as by the use of Milton and Shakespeare. They ought, with the sophists of old, to be willing to teach students to speak well on nonsensical or frivolous subjects and to speak well on both sides of the same proposition. Method is method, and ought to be applicable to any subject-matter. This is the logical outcome of an insistence on method as separate from content, which comes from the pragmatic view of human nature.

Enough has been said to indicate the bearing of the ultimate questions of education on our immediate problems as teachers of public speaking. It is a truism that a man's philosophy is the most important thing about him to all those who work with him. So in educational disputes our underlying view of man's nature—and hence of the educational process appropriate to it—really determines our choice of position.

Is the logic too old-fashioned that insists on deducing our specific aim from the general purpose of the whole educational

system? If it is, chaos is come again. If it is not, then let us say at once that every specialist should have a general outlook on the whole field of collegiate education, should hold a conscious theory of the educational process.

The larger strategy of education may be of no use in solving the problem of content; it may not alter the fundamental course so long discussed; it may change no detail of practice for any one of us. And then again it may. But these other things it will do: it will give us as a profession a greater power of attracting the type of student and teacher we want, a firmer justification of our demands for consideration, and a surer sense of our own function in the educational scheme.

CONTENT AND FORM

W. P. SANDFORD
Ohio State University

DISCUSSION about the supervision of speech content, advocated by Professor Hunt of Cornell and the writer, has ranged so far from the point at issue that it is desirable to clarify the situation. Just what are the essential points of difference between those who favor some sort of systematic attention to subject matter and those who do not? And what was actually advocated in the two articles which originally raised this question?

Professor O'Neill of Wisconsin has made some very definite charges against the writers of the two articles in question. He has said that their proposals constitute "the most dangerous attack upon the dignity and worth of instruction in public speaking in our generation," and that if such doctrines are approved, instruction in public speaking will disappear from the colleges and universities of our land. Specifically, he asserts that the writers propose to teach something else than public speaking, and that there is no need for supervision of speech content. In effect, he asserts that the whole task of the public speaking instructor is to teach form—delivery and speech composition—and that any one who advocates anything else has no place in the profession.

To remain silent in the face of his charges would seem to indicate acquiescene in them. This is especially true because of the violent terms in which they were couched. In replying to his criticisms of my article, "The Problem of Speech Content," I shall attempt, first, to point out certain misinterpretations he has made, and second, to meet some of his objections which are relevant to the issue.

It is perhaps well, before beginning the discussion, to point out that neither Professor Hunt nor I advocated abandonment of (or even a relaxation of effort in) the teaching of delivery or speech composition; that the plans we proposed for supervision of speech content were intended merely as suggestions to supplement instruction in delivery and composition; and that many of the greatest teachers of public speaking, from Isocrates down, have laid stress upon content as well as upon form. In other words, we proposed no radical departure from approved practice. Our alleged radicalism was largely a matter of the critic's interpretation.

Let us consider some points which Professor O'Neill misinterpreted. His fundamental mistake is that we would *substitute* instruction in subject matter for instruction in delivery and composition. He says, "The two papers under consideration have both taken the position that the only way to get the second (course content) is through the first (speech content)." And again, "Both writers assume_____that the content of the students' speeches constitutes the only possible content for a course in public speaking." And again, "They would, apparently, give courses in public speaking for the primary purpose of teaching philosophy and economics —not public speaking." I fail to see how a fair reading of my article could have led him to such conclusions. Certainly no such meaning was intended. *Had the article purported to set forth views as to the course in its entirety,* Professor O'Neill's criticism would be justified, but as a matter of fact, discussion was limited to the specific problem of *speech content.* No attempt was made to discuss other phases of the course.

Furthermore, it was clearly stated that delivery and speech composition were not to be neglected. In the introduction, I said "Our primary purpose is as stated," i. e., "to teach students to speak well, and to organize their material well." Again, in the second paragraph, this statement was made, "How to deal with the problem of (speech) content, *while at the same time giving due atten-*

tion to delivery and the principles of speech organization, is a problem that well merits attention." Why, then, should it be alleged that I propose to abandon or neglect delivery and composition?

Professor O'Neill charges, second, that we would give direct instruction in philosophy and economics. He quotes me as saying, "Instruction in speech content is necessary." He interprets that phrase to suit his purpose. My article in its entirety does not advocate teaching economics. It advocates "instruction in speech content" through "attention to subject matter," guidance in the selection of topics, supervision of the gathering of speech material, and greater emphasis upon what is said, principally by means of the open forum type of discussion. It does not advocate usurpation of the functions of other departments. Indeed, it specifically suggests that students be sent to instructors in other departments for information. But Professor O'Neill has not taken the trouble to consider the methods suggested. Instead, he seizes upon the particular example which was used for illustrative purposes, and declares, "Surely, if the emphasis is placed on taxation (which is one of Mr. Sandford's *substitutes*), *and not on public speaking,* we have essentially a course in taxation, and not a course in public speaking." The unfair implication in the italicized words is evident. The essence of my proposal was not that we teach economics, but that we adopt some method of guiding the accumulation of speech material.

Professor O'Neill takes exception to the suggestion that the instructor guide the discussion of content in class. Surely some guidance is necessary if the discussion is to be of value. The average instructor in public speaking should not be so ignorant of, or indifferent to, the vital questions of the day that he could not take a role similar to that of chairman at a public meeting. I dare assert that he has a right, upon occasion, to criticise statements made by youthful speakers, and that without being guilty of usurping the function of any other department. Nor does this mean that he would be teaching economics. We cannot build a Chinese Wall of thought around the field of public speaking. (Incidentally, from what I have heard of Professor O'Neill's classes, he has not religiously abstained from criticism of content.)

The third misinterpretation is this: Professor O'Neill insinuates that I have no respect for the "course content" of public speaking. He puts this statement into my mouth. "Well, if we

can't teach the social sciences, what can we teach? We have to teach something to be academically respectable, and there is nothing in public speaking. It has no content of its own." And then my critic exclaims, "No content! Nothing to teach!" and proceeds to denounce me in good round terms, informing me, as if I were hearing it for the first time, that many distinguished men have written on public speaking! Again, his implication is obvious. I catagorically deny holding the sentiments he has ascribed to me. They were thrust into my mouth for the purpose of discrediting my position, and for no other reason. Fairness would have demanded at least a letter of inquiry as to my views. No such letter was written. So far as I am aware, no investigation of any kind was made. Professor O'Neill was content to score a debating point.

So much for the misinterpretations and misconceptions into which my critic has fallen. Stripped of this extraneous matter, the issue remains, "Is supervision of speech content desirable?" Professor O'Neill asserts that it is not, at least he says that, as an objective for a public speaking course, what the student knows about his topic is "none of the business of the instructor in public speaking." He hedges as follows, "I am not recommending that the instructor *ignore* the subjects of students' speeches," and "in a case where poverty of ideas and lack of information is complete, the instructor might well adopt some method of *helping the student to get some ideas.*" Why this qualification? If we are to help the student to get some ideas, need we wait until the lack of ideas is complete? Professor O'Neill justifies this position by saying that we should not *furnish* ideas; and there we are in perfect accord. What I propose is some method of helping the student to get some ideas, and I am convinced that some such method would be of benefit to the class as a whole.

It is claimed, however, that I have not proved the necessity of a thorough-going system for guidance in getting ideas. Obviously, such necessity can be only a matter of opinion. It is not susceptible of exact proof. However, my conclusions were not based solely on personal observation, as is implied. They were based also on the opinions of several prominent professors of public speaking in different universities—men whose ideas are entitled to respect.

Two prominent criticisms remain. Professor O'Neill objects

to my suggestion that the field of topics be limited to social, economic, and political questions; and he objects to the assignment of one topic, to be discussed in a series of speeches. With the first of these I shall not deal. The suggestion was not made with the idea of rigorously excluding all other classes of topics. Certainly it is a debatable matter, but in my opinion the fields suggested contain topics of the greatest general interest, and therefore are most valuable. However, if a student had a vital interest in some other field, I should not hesitate to let him talk in that field. Whether or not this proposal is "far ahead in the race for arbitrary control," and constitutes a "super system," as Professor O'Neill charges, simply becomes a matter of how rigidly it is applied. Professor O'Neill fails to see the difference between making a decision as to the fields in which speeches shall be encouraged, and arbitrarily insisting that all speeches must be made in those fields. The interests and preferences of individual students may well be taken into account.

The second of these objections—that nothing is to be gained by taking a "term topic" does not appear to be well founded. Professor O'Neill supports it merely with the statement that "a knowledge of one question in social science as the prime objective of a course in public speaking, seems to me a rather pitiable aim." Again, his interpretation is faulty. Let me remind him that such knowledge is not the "prime objective."

On this matter of the "term topic" I am tempted to quote from Professor Winans, who is certainly acceptable to Professor O'Neill as authority. On pages 92 and 93 of "Public Speaking," he says:

> "Another encouraging circumstance is that not every speech need be made in a new field. Any subject has many phases, any one of which is likely to prove more than sufficient for a speech, provided the speaker is well informed. The desire to range superficially all over a large subject is evidence of ignorance. Having spoken on one phase of a subject, next time the speaker may take another phase of the same subject, and he will find that the previous study proves helpful. *Knowledge, mastery, and interest will grow; the speeches will be better and the incidental culture greater than if one touches superficially many fields.* (Italics are mine.)

Of course, I am not here quoting Professor Winans as being in accord with all of my proposals, but the passage above is a striking endorsement of the use of one topic for a series of speeches, and substantiates the claims that were made for it. I have received

letters endorsing the "term topic" idea from several prominent teachers of public speaking.

So much for Professor O'Neill's article. I have endeavored first, to clear up certain misconceptions of my attitude which appeared in his article, and second, to meet certain of his objections to the specific plan for the supervision of subject matter which I proposed. The issue is not "Shall we substitute instruction in speech content for instruction in course content," but rather, "Shall we add to instructions in course content a systematic attention to speech content?" The attitude which we as teachers of public speaking take upon that issue is of vital importance—indeed, I feel that progress in our field is to no small extent dependent upon it.

We at Ohio State believe and teach that "what the speaker says is at least as important as how he says it." Professor Ketcham expresses our attitude in this statement, "Public speaking is primarily a constructive thinking process, not merely a sound-making operation. We are of course interested in matters of delivery, such as voice development and action. We are primarily interested in developing the capacity of the student to analyze speaking problems, sift the essential from the trivial, and exercise judgment in weighing facts and ideas with regard to the probable effect on the hearer." In its practical application, this encompasses attention to subject matter as well as to speech composition.

Nor are we alone in this attitude. Professor Winans, whom Professor O'Neill considers one of the two leading authorities on public speaking in our generation, devotes two lengthy chapters to the necessity of "having something to say." I have had expressions of opinion from outstanding figures in our profession, authors of texts and heads of departments, emphasizing the necessity of attention to subject matter.

If we neglect content, and restrict our instruction to form, we are evading half of our responsibility. We are teaching public speaking as a mere matter of technique, not as a vehicle of truth. Content and form are not mutually exclusive. Good instruction must secure both, otherwise it perverts the function of public speaking. We must have adequate methods of teaching form, and we must also have adequate methods of securing content. This posi-

tion is both "ancient and honorable." It implies that we should seek to conserve the highest ideal of public speaking—"the orator is a good man" (an ethical, well-informed man) skilled in speaking."

"SPEECH" FROM ANOTHER ANGLE

E. C. MABIE
University of Iowa

THE dispute over the title of the National Association and of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL is becoming intriguing. It is much more intriguing than important. I must protest the title "Teachers of Rhetoric" (Professor Winans' "no compromise" title) or "Teachers of Speech and Rhetoric." I do not wish to be read out of the party. I do not like being told that when members of the National Association of Teachers of Speech are classified in the order of importance, teachers of rhetoric are the aristocrats and the rest of us who are teaching interpretative reading or the dramatic arts are to be forever excluded from the aristocracy. Professor Winans' proposal that the name be "Teachers of Speech and Rhetoric" provides for and emphasizes the special field in which he has made his personal contribution as a teacher and as a writer. It is a personal contribution which I admire and to the equal value of which I aspire in my own corner of the field. And it is highly desirable that others continue to investigate the field of rhetoric and the history of oratory. We will all rejoice in any "important developments in that historic branch of knowledge." Those of us who are not teaching rhetoric or the history of oratory have no wish to belittle the workers or the importance of that field.

But when the teachers of rhetoric request that those of us who are working in the field of the dramatic arts, interpretative reading, and kindred fields, take a rear seat, the situation becomes amusing. Just as certainly as the title "Teachers of Speech and Rhetoric" is proposed to the convention, I shall wish to propose a change to the title "Teachers of Speech and Acting" or "Teachers of Speech and Dramatic Production." And I hope some worker in another field

will propose the title "Teachers of Speech and Interpretative Reading," or anything else that may emphasize his specialty. I shall make my proposal with all the sincerity of Professor Winans' argument. No one can deny that whoever else teaches acting or dramatic art, we teach it; not in those ancient methods, however honorable they may have been in their time; but giving due respect to traditions, we hope we make some little contribution to more effective teaching as a result of contact with modern educational methods and scientific investigation. It may be said that the term *acting* has bad connotations; but so has *elocution* and *oratory*,—and *rhetoric* according to Professor Winans' own admission. On the other hand, *acting* is a term with an honorable history. It is associated with an institution twenty-five centuries old. It is associated with such mighty names as Shakespeare, Talma, Coquelin, Garrick, Siddons, Kean, and Irving, to say nothing of notable modern actors and producers. It is a traditional family name for many of us.

Professor Winans argues that his special field of activity should be emphasized in the title of the Association and of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL. As long as other fields are to be represented his associates can reasonably make no greater claim to that distinction than can mine, or Miss Johnson's, or Dr. Blanton's, or any other. I dare say if Professor Winans' title were adopted, we would hear objections from teachers in other phases of the field, some of those whom Professor Winans has generously given place in his paragraph of subtitles.

The search for a *comprehensive* term to *cover* the field in which so many of us are associated has thus far been without result. I think in some respects, that this is a happy situation. A comprehensive and all-covering, all-inclusive term is not desirable. Perhaps a good illustration of the sort of title which makes it possible to get everything under one canvas is that of departments of *History*. Recently I have observed that some workers in the field of history have become tired of the search for facts about nations and political institutions, and have extended their claims to include the history of nearly every institution and activity that has been involved in the progress of civilization. I find among the courses in some departments of history titles like this: "Social and *Cultural* History of the United States," a title which can easily be interpreted to cover the history of institutions like the theatre and also

the history of oratory. The title of the field is so comprehensive that no limitations are placed upon incursions into the historical background of any subject in the academic curriculum.

The advantages of the title "Speech" do not lie in the fact that it covers everything. There is no point in endeavoring to stretch definitions of the term so as to make it include the gamut of subjects taught, studied, or investigated, by the several hundred members of the National Association. Accept the term *speech* with the definition that it is "the faculty of uttering articulate sounds or words; of expressing thought by words or language." Or accept another phrasing, "Speech is primarily the communication of ideas through meaningful voice sounds and bodily actions."

The advantage of the title *Speech* then lies in the fact that it designates the particular ground which all of those who are members of the Association must inevitably have in common. Professor Winans and Professor Hunt may do their special work in the field of rhetoric or the history of oratory; but they cannot escape the fact that they must give attention to speech in the sense in which I have defined it. They cannot escape the fact that speech in that sense is the element which has bound together all of the periods in the history of oratory, whatever may have been the changes in theories of construction and of style in oral discourse. Professor O'Neill and other writers and teachers of debate may find their investigations leading them into logic and even legal procedure, but they cannot escape giving attention to speech. Professor Bassett and Professor Johnson may carry their investigations into the field of literature in connection with their study of interpretative reading; but they cannot avoid giving attention to speech. Professor Dolman may work in the dramatic arts and carry his investigations into the fields of literature, of physics, of optics, of music, of architecture, etc.; but he too must give speech important consideration. Professor Merry may specialize in voice science and applied phonetics, Professor Woolbert in behavior, Professor Blanton in the correction of speech defects; but in all their work not one of them can escape the necessity of giving attention to speech. It is in the study of speech in the sense in which I have defined it that all members of the National Association meet on a common ground. To designate the National Association and the QUARTERLY JOURNAL by that term impresses me as being most satisfactory.

One of the most important points in Professor Winans' argu-

ment appears to be this: that over a long period of years in which he and other teachers of public speaking and rhetoric have been working in particular institutions and localities, they have built up a "good will" for those terms, a "good will" which would be destroyed by the adoption of the term speech. Of course that argument applies only to those institutions and localities in which this has been done. I have no objection to his retaining a title for his department which includes the terms rhetoric or public speaking. But the terms acting and dramatic art have a similar "good will" which has been built up in other institutions and in other localities. And the same has become true of the term Speech in Wisconsin and in Iowa, where, as the title of a department, the term indicates the common ground upon which teachers of public speaking, oral expression, debate, rhetoric, dramatic art and interpretative reading, correction of speech defects, and voice science have found it convenient to associate themselves in an academic institution. But that "good will" argument, even though we may talk about the "good will" of such scholars as Professor Shorey (His interest by the way is confined as much to a limited field as is Professor Winans') cannot be permitted to carry great weight with the National Association.

In the National Association are men who are interested in fields other than rhetoric. Unless there is a definite desire to exclude them, I would suggest that we retain the term which designates a common basis of interest as the title of both the National Association and the QUARTERLY JOURNAL.

TEACHING SPEECH READING TO THE DEAF*

MARTHA E. BRUHN
Müller-Walle School, Boston, Mass.

IN 1902, when I opened my school with three pupils enrolled, I had one course of thirty lessons outlined. Today we have various courses, not only for the regular beginners' work, but also for advanced work and for normal training. Each year has brought a clearer, deeper, and richer insight into the problems of the day.

From my experience one or two things have impressed me to the exclusion of some others that I used to think more important. The first is the very great need of laying a thoroughly sound foundation for the would-be lip reader. Not only should the matter be most lucidly explained to the pupil and repeated to him in different forms until the teacher is sure that he comprehends it from every angle, but he must also have a workable knowledge of the same. This is true of every other subject, so why not of lip reading?

Within the past three or four years the question of the value of a so-called synthetic or psychological method, compared with a so-called analytical method, has been widely discussed. I am convinced that both are necessary in order to become a good lip reader, and in my demonstration today I would like to show how the Müller-Walle method has kept, on the one hand, by means of its systematic drills, to the analytical idea, and on the other hand, by its stories and conversational exercises, to the synthetic idea. To have a school stand for only one of these, or even to put more emphasis on one, seems to me to be wrong. It is, however, not necessary for the pupil to be conscious of the method by which he is guided. One individual may need much systematic drilling; another may be harmed by the same and must be led away from it as soon as possible. This must be left to the discretion of the teacher.

The syllable drill of the Müller-Walle method seems to me to be

* Read at the annual meeting of the National Association of Teachers of Speech, New York University, December 28, 1922.

the most logical and sequential way of training the eye to be accurate, to be quick, and to do its work subconsciously. It begins with the simplest elements, and it accrues block by block in a related order, until we have a structure of words with meaning.

Take our first lesson, for example; we begin by telling the pupil what is meant by position and movement.

Position is one sound prolonged.

Movement is the passing from one sound to another.

Conversation is movement, continual passing from one sound to another, therefore the lip reader must learn to follow *movements.* We begin with the five vowel sound ä, ō, o͞o, ā, ē. We explain the movement of the lips, chin, of cheeks in the production of each of these. They are then practised together in this way:

ä ō o͞o	ō o͞o ä	o͞o ä ō	ā ē ä
ä o͞o ō	ō ä o͞o	ä ā ē	ä ā ē etc.

These are given in varying positions, *en* profile, *en* face, and with increased speed. After they have been practised several times in this way, the teacher covers a part of the mouth with his hand, directing the pupils' attention to the cheek and jaw movements. If the teacher holds a pencil in front of the lips as a kind of measuring rod, the pupil often distinguishes the vowel movement more readily.

We do not work too long on the vowels by themselves, merely long enough to enable the pupil to recognize them fairly well, because we are going to combine them at once with consonants and to continue the drills with the syllables. The vowel movement is the principal movement of the whole syllable. The consonants, especially those that precede the vowel, take more or less the direction of the vowel that follows them, and therefore are subject to many changes. The letter *f*, for example, pronounced alone, shows a backward movement of the lower lip, the upper lip remains stationary; but in making *f* before a vowel as in fō fo͞o both lips move in the direction of the ō and o͞o in order to give the necessary inter-movement and to pronounce the vowel without pausing. The same is true in fā fe͞e. The lips immediately take the direction of the vowel, in this case a backward movement. In order to learn to distinguish the manifold changes which consonants in connection with different vowels undergo, they must be practised in every possible combination.

Taking the *f, s,* and *m,* we prefix them to the vowels just practiced and make syllables, thus:

Fä fō fo͞o, mä mō mo͞o, sä sō so͞o.

In practising these syllables the order is constantly changed. Two or three are put together, as: so fo, sō fä, mō fā, mä fā, mä sā, sē mō, etc.

In this lesson *th, sh* and *w* and *wh,* are also practised with the vowels.

Syllable drill:

shē mā
shē fā
shē fō
shē mō
wē mā
thā mā
thā sō
thā mā sō
thā mā sē mē
They may see me sew the seam.

The teacher must be prepared to give the syllables in ever-changing combinations with the fluency of natural speech and with a certain rhythm. She must adapt these drills to her pupils. The pupil really enjoys these syllable drills, especially when they lead up to a sentence.

In each lesson a new combination of syllables is studied. Those of the previous lessons are constantly repeated and mingled with the new ones, somewhat in this way:

sō fä	dē fī	thō wē mā rō
sō sī	dē sī	thō shē mā rī
thā sī	rē sī	shō mē thē rī
thā sē	bē sī	shō mē thē sē
thā sē mē	pre si	shō her thē fā
thā sē mī	pre fer	shō her thē lō
thā mā mī	dē fer	shō mē thē lā
thā sā mī	dē cli	shō mē thē wā
hē sâ mī	We must decline	Show me the way to
hē sâ mī no͞o	the invitation.	the lake.

He saw my new knife.

We find the same line of work carried out in the study of music. The student first masters the different keys by practising

the scales, then applies what he has learned to exercises in the various keys. Practising syllables corresponds to the practising of scales. Drill work and practise are just as essential in lip reading as in acquiring a musical accomplishment. For lip reading is an art, not a science.

The Müller-Walle method is now taught in forty-eight of our state institutions for the deaf all over the country. Teachers report, "Pupils love the syllable drill. It helps their speech and clears out speech defects—even two cases of stammering have been helped."

Syllable drills, to my mind, are better than word drills. There are too many homophonous words. In giving a pupil a list of words his mind is on the word, while in reading syllables he can concentrate his whole attention to the movement, knowing there is no meaning. Drill work in lip reading can be made attractive. Keep it dynamic and it will swing itself. End your syllable drills with a keen, live sentence and your pupils will respond. It all rests with the teacher as to how it is given. A pupil must be equipped with, not only an understanding of positions, but with the ability to recognize them. How can he get that ability but by having them repeatedly shown him, not in stories where his mind is running with the story, (these have their place too, in every lesson) but in abstract form. If he can recognize syllables in the abstract, with no context, he surely can recognize them with the background of sentences. This, to me, is *foundation* for lip reading.

Syllable drills, however, should not be made too long, as they tire the eyes much more than sentences. After they have been practised from three to five minutes at a time, sentences containing words based on the respective sounds are given, or in other words, these syllable drills are put to practical use. For our first lesson, we have a vocabulary of over one hundred words made up entirely of the sounds practised in that lesson.

Some exercises are especially planned to show certain important characteristics of the movements of the organs of speech; for example, accent or rhythm. Let us take the pronouns *I, she, he, it, we, they.* Given thus alone, each has a definite position of its own. Following this by a drill on *I shall, he shall, they shall,* etc., we see at once that the accent falling on the auxiliary *shall,* the pronoun is less important.

Next we add a verb to the auxiliary, as for example, *I shall see,*

I shall pay, I may sew. Here the accent falls on the verb, giving the auxiliary a different appearance. Then we add a noun or a pronoun to the phrase, thus: *I shall see the farm, I may say so to them,* accenting the new word or phrase. Lastly, we begin the sentence with a pronoun or an adverb, *Where shall I buy the farm? Why shall I sew the seam for you?* The ever-changing rhythm in these different sentences gives a different movement to the single word,—first a long, then a short, a principal or a secondary movement. Thus the eye is trained to separate the words in a sentence correctly.

Much is said in these days of efficiency. How shall we reach the greatest efficiency in our work? In Boston we feel we are solving that problem by our *group work.* It is natural for the pupil to understand the teacher best. Pupils in our school have always been given practise with three or four teachers besides that given by normal students. But I have felt for some time that greater efficiency might be obtained if pupils were given more practise with untrained lips. During the past two years I have made a specialty of devising a system which makes this possible. It has been my experience that pupils get far more out of this than they do listening to a story from the lips of a trained teacher, with whose lips they are already familiar.

The real problem is the teacher's. How can she control a group of students, say, four or five, and give them profitable material and get it before them with order and speed? In the first place, she must not let the work drag. Pupuls must be given to understand that in such classes we cannot allow too much repetition. If the pupil knows that a sentence will be repeated, he forms a habit and depends upon this. Whereas, if he knows it will be said only once, he is more eager to get it the first time. Of course, we do repeat sometimes.

Secondly, the material must be *worth while,* or an apathy will inevitably settle on the group. But, given good material, put in good order, little trouble will arise. As their interest is sustained, they will unconsciously converse and lose themselves in their eagerness to follow the general trend.

Group work does another thing. It teaches deaf people to work with one another. The real function of lip reading is to enable the pupil to take his place again in the world; and he is far more likely to do so with this intermediate mingling with pupils

and trying his wings under guidance of the teacher. Pupils who take part in this group work must be on an equal footing and have an equal share. Thus one pupil being in turn teacher does not work so well as to have responsibility more evenly distributed. In these courses, the work is prepared so that each in turn may participate.

In Course I the exercises are based on the lessons in the book. In Course II sentences are longer and so arranged that pupils must add new words or phrases. Course III is for advanced pupils. Each exercise is on a different subject of general interest; for example, on "Advertising in Ancient and Modern Times," "Gold," "Silk," "Radium," "Aluminum," "Our Forests." Some are travel talks, "A trip from Cape Town to Cairo," "Iceland," etc. I have prepared each of these exercises myself. Each set contains sixty sentences, to be read by four pupils. If there are more in the class, the others watch, but take part in the conversation. Pupils are allowed to ask questions, or to give any other information relating to the subject in question. How much these exercises are enjoyed may be seen by the fact that several pupils have volunteered to hunt up articles in magazines to be used for exercises of this kind. Three pupils have written exercises on subjects chosen by themselves.

The longer I teach, the more I come to value the group idea, of course after the foundation has been laid. It not only saves time and gives pupils much more practise than they would otherwise get, but it gives the individual pupil a varied experience impossible with one teacher. He gets pleasure from being an integral part. He gets confidence in addressing people. Instead of becoming self-centered, he becomes interested in his fellow students and in all that concerns them. He becomes helpful. If one of the group has a little more trouble than the others, he will come to that one's assistance and will repeat or put the same thing a little differently, and the other one gets it and is grateful.

Lip reading is not learned over night. To become proficient takes much practise.

THE FUNCTION OF THE TEACHER'S TASTE IN ORAL ENGLISH

LILY C. OSMER
Berkeley, California

"You gonta take oral English?" asks a high school boy of his fellow.

"Who's gonta teach it?" asks his class mate, Yankee fashion.

"Miss Bird!"

"O, boy, excuse me. I'll tell the world I'm not."

"They say she knows a lot about English."

"I'll say she does. I took English Lit under her. Don't I know what she'd do in public speaking? She'd say, 'Richard, tell the class in the most artistic way the aesthetic grandeur of the Parthenon.' I'd say, 'O hang it all I don't even know what it is or whether it had a grand—eur.' "

A teacher may have an artistic temperament, highly developed, may know her subject in its entirety, but may fail because she tries to dominate her pupils' thinking with her own tastes. If a woman teacher abhors football, thinks it a relic of barbarism, and is unnerved at the suggestion of the subject, she should allow her oral English student who loves football, is captain of the team, and is taking expression in order to speak well in behalf of the team, to talk on football. Furthermore, although her artistic temperament, her extreme culture, abhors slang through every fibre of her being, she should yet allow him to say, "Take it from me, we're coming home with the bacon." On the other hand, the man who is teaching oral English and who insists on making some little "flapper" say a nice little speech with carefully penned notes on the content of the most recent legislation of Congress, will likely get no expression at all.

Whenever freedom of expression is expected or demanded, there should be freedom of thought. The student should choose his subject from a wide range of subjects and not be impeded in his progress by the teacher's taste, which sometimes is mere eccen-

tricity. Then, the teacher may have a highly artificial manner of expression which the child should not be allowed to imitate. The teacher may be very nervous, or very emotional, or rigidly collected, and then expect the child to conform to pattern in order to show good taste or correct expression.

Recently I interviewed an author who said, "It matters not what medium you use; story, lecture, play, or poem. The fundamental point is, *have a message.*" If that be true, as it undoubtedly is, how can all students have messages according to the teacher's taste? How can that student express any message honestly and obey the command, "Be natural," and yet cater to the teacher's particular taste? Students are already too much given to studying the teacher's peculiar inclinations and giving back only that which will produce the best effect, thereby insuring highest grades. Yet this does not mean that the teacher's taste has no place at all in the class room, that her purpose is to teach expression by drawing out the student's own ability upon the line of his own particular interest, uninfluenced by the teacher's judgment and culture. I do not mean that the teacher's taste has no place in the class room. I mean that it should not dominate. A student imitates unconsciously a worthy teacher, one who inspires confidence. The finest art in teaching is so to modify the tastes of the student, to instill culture, to uplift the student, yet without leaving the student aware of the teacher's purpose. The wise teacher will "tone up" or "tone down" the student according to the individual need while the student is intently interested in his own subject; this she does by her own judgment or her taste, applied judiciously.

The highly artificial individual is not a real teacher, for she is continually trying to compel the student to conform to a taste so unnatural that the student is under a strain trying to imitate the exacting example. Students should be taught so that "they may contribute the maximum good for all." They can never do that by conforming to a pattern. H. B. Carreker in *The High School Quarterly* says, "Character is the result of living, doing, achieving, associating, thinking, acting the part. It may be right sometimes to assume an excellence which we do not possess as a means to the attainment of it." I agree with his statement so long as it is not taken to mean that the teacher has a right to make a student artificial.

In his concluding remarks of this same article, Mr. Carreker

strikes the chord that vibrates with my thinking upon the function of the teacher's taste. Of course he is not discussing taste at all. He is discussing the teacher, but to me it says "this is where the teacher's taste speaks": "The teacher himself is the 'living epistle known and read of all men.' 'Perform any act in the presence of a pupil, and if he has it in him to do that deed, he is likely,' says La Rue, 'other things being favorable, to attempt it.' As teachers the best we can do for our pupils is to live—live, not so seriously to be sure, but joyfully, earnestly, honestly, and wisely if possible. 'The path of the just is as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.' "

Perhaps it is because of the high school teacher's conscientiousness that she often becomes so highly artificial. She is so determined that the student shall never find a flaw in her; that he can never make a mistake in imitating what she says, does, or thinks. She tries to make herself a finished work of art, polished to the highest degree, radiating knowledge, culture, perfect expression, poise, rhythm, skill, technique, and all other virtues, from every angle, and at all times. She speaks with just the right modulation, the correct quality, force, rate, and pitch required to express every specific thought. She sounds her "ahs" perfectly. She displays her emotions dramatically, always under perfect control. She dresses in blending shades not too gay nor too drab. Her clothes are cut in artistic lines. She uses all the best forms of etiquette, and always does the right thing in the right way at the right time. Then Miss Prim trains her student to appear in the county contest. To her everlasting chagrin he wins third place in the contest of three contestants!

I think Professor Akin must have had some such thought in mind when he said, according to the report in the Oakland *Tribune*, July 27, 1922, that married women made better teachers than do spinsters, because the married woman who rears children has a more intimate touch with life, knows the child best, is more natural and human, and therefore can give a more human touch to her teaching. He went so far as to say that the woman who had no real contact with the problems of life should be forced to take up some practical work for a time in order to acquire that human touch. The teacher described above foists upon her student very bad taste indeed through her own desire to escape that very result. It is only the student with strong enough personality or indi-

viduality to let himself show through this veneer who can succeed under such teaching.

Then there is the teacher who "abhors quiet tones." His student is going to be heard. Consequently his student knows only one element of voice, that is force. He bellows on all occasions. Another teacher's pet hobby is action. The student in order to make good grades under this teacher must exercise vigorously every muscle in his body until he comes before the public a puppet performing all sort of gymnastic stunts accompanied by speech which gives the audience the impression that the speech was arranged for the gestures.

At times one almost despairs of finding a teacher who is free from some of the eccentricities which that particular teacher calls "good taste" or "the proper thing to do." However, there are many who can stand before their students, an example worthy of imitation of that which is conceded by most people as commendable taste. That teacher is "natural." She is well read, well informed, broad-minded, sympathetic, cultured; but over and above it all is a simplicity, a directness, an individuality, a personality "toned up," and "toned down" properly. She is well tuned empathically; she can appreciate almost everything. It is by heroic effort that she stays with the profession, for man admires such a woman and wants her for his own. Under such teachers the student exerts himself to his full capacity because he will not disappoint *her*.

"To enjoy beauty is often considered effeminate. In instances where this is true it is due to a lack of balance between the individual's intellectual and emotional state." This is the problem that confronts every teacher. In public speaking it must be dealt with indirectly. As Langfeld says in his discussion of intellectualism and emotionalism in "The Aesthetic Attitude," "Spontaneity may follow an introspective and analytical study, and furthermore the artist is at one stage of the creating process, both artist and audience, just as the audience shares, to a certain degree, the activity of the artist. In both cases there is a very definite adjustment of the organism to the environment, which must be thoroughly known and differentiated from other adjustments which the organism undergoes in the course of its development." In the classroom or during individual preparation for public speaking, the teacher is the audience to which the student adjusts.

Never for a moment must the student be conscious of any transmission of the teacher's taste, or of any newly given appreciation of beauty; for with that consciousness comes a change of attitude. For instance, the teacher has succeeded in instilling into the student a sense of the beauty of the expression:

> Alas for him who never sees
> The sun shine through his cypress trees,
> Who hopeless lays his dead away,
> Nor looks to see the break of day
> Across the mournful marble play.

He is expressing the thought beautifully, until his fellow student suggests to him that the teacher is "preaching at him." He immediately loses his vision of the beauty of the thought, and falls to earth with a thud. Langfeld says, again, "Although it is desirable to have as much human appeal as possible, it is evident that the more appeal there is, other things being equal, that is, the less distant, the more likelihood there will be of loss of aesthetic attitude." It goes without saying that a teacher must not permit any asides, any distractions, or division of interest during the training of students in public speaking. It means the loss of the point gained for the time being if not permanently.

It is possible for a student so to admire a teacher's taste that he will unwittingly be reproducing what she is producing. We see this so strongly marked in the nature of the little child learning the piano who has not learned to suppress his desires. He plays the thing over just as the teacher did it; for the time being in his own mind, he is the teacher. Last May, immediately after a May-day program given by college students a group of small children ran into a grove. They organized their court, utilized a coat for a retinue, and with each attendant in place, followed the play queen to her throne in exactly the same way that the college students had done it. Their taste had been directed by good example in those they admired.

I believe the most appealing teacher is the one who shows good taste with no apparent effort to do so; she is like a skater making graceful curves upon the ice with no apparent effort, with a glowing expression of warmth and joy. It is the well-balanced teacher who succeeds in instilling into her students the degree of good taste that she herself possesses. She is alive. She is healthy. She can

play tennis or basketball with any of her students, and take hikes over mountains, through brush and creeks, sit on the ground, or do anything that a healthy young person delights in doing on holidays, with the keenest of enjoyment. She can discuss political, social, economic, scientific, and mathematical problems, as well as literature and the current news. She can appreciate music, painting, and nature. She can understand the home life and the particular problems of her students, and so understanding can and does help and sympathize. Beyond and over and above this, she has a deep reverence, adoration, and love for things eternal. She appreciates the values in the spiritual world just as much as in the mental and physical. She is symmetrically developed. She makes her students feel it is good to live, that life is a joy. Joy everyone is looking for, and it is contagious; once you feel the real joy of life that comes through symmetrical development of the physical, mental, and spiritual this is permanent. Never yet have I seen such a teacher who did not always give a thrill, who did not always have a message, and who did not always get a joyous response from her students. It is living; it is life to be in her classes. It is always working, yet always working everyone else.

Just as taste is an expression of self, so the teaching of better taste becomes the commending, not of abstract standards and rules ungrasped or misunderstood, but the deeply understood and vitally appreciated character that is itself the beauty the rules would teach.

THE STYLE OF EXTEMPORANEOUS SPEECH

WAYLAND MAXFIELD PARRISH
University of Pittsburgh

"ORATORY in the classical sense of the term, as an art taught, studied, and pursued, has practically ceased to exist, and has almost become the traditional subject of a gibe or a sneer." With this statement of Earl Curzon, made ten years ago in an address at the University of Cambridge, most modern students of public speaking will readily agree. It is a commonplace that the style in speaking has changed since the days of Webster, and the relation of modern speaking to ancient oratory is one of contrast. The close

attention to form, the fastidious nicety of diction, the re-use of one's own gems of expresssion, the criticism of the stylistic shortcomings of an opponent, the elaborate training of speakers, the exacting demands of the audience for elegance of expression, the collection of exordia or commonplaces to use as occasion might serve, the tracing of analogies between oratory and the arts, especially sculpture—all these and other characteristics of ancient oratory which Jebb points out in the introductory chapter of his work on the Attic Orators are far on the road to ultimate extinction. Even that last refuge of the "art of oratory," the highly artificial college oratorical contest, shows symptoms of a descent to sanity.

But Earl Curzon's statement applied to American practise is a little premature. We find it hard to free ourselves from the tyranny of the oratorical manner so recently exemplified by Webster. Popular taste is still confused. Our educational machinery is not yet completely adjusted to the newer fashion. In spite of the modern drift toward a more practical style of speaking, students are still coming to college and, alas, leaving college, with the notion that a speech to be excellent as a speech must be composed in what Paul Shorey calls (Q. J. S. E. VIII, 109) "the florid, antithetic, jingling style of sophomoric ornament." As Professor Dolman points out in the opening chapter of his *Handbook of Public Speaking* (P. 7), they still confuse speaking with oratory as a fine art, "a thing like music or sculpture, that calls for special gift, years of drill, a masterly technique, an artistic soul; a thing essentially artificial, mysteriously unreal, to be successfully performed only by a temperamental genius—a talker rather than a doer."

For example, a freshman boy asked to write the opening sentences of a speech on the Ruhr situation illustrating how he would get interest, turned out this effusion: "Friends, as lovers of liberty and freedom we have united here, this evening to delve into the old continent where that liberty which we fought for in '76 and later in 1917 is being wrested from men, women and children who are not unlike we here in this auditorium this evening."

This misconception of oral style in the student's mind is not difficult to account for. The average student is trained in preparatory school in writing English, not in speaking it. That there is a difference between oral and written style has probably never occurred to him. The ideals held before him in composition are faultlessness and elegance rather than energy and distinction. His

models are very probably Addison, Pater, Newman, and Van Dyke —masters of beautiful essay English. If he has studied speech literature at all, the materials used were doubtless the customary Washington, Webster, Lincoln selections with possibly the addition of Wilson—all models of written, or oratorical, or Biblical style. If he has had any training in speech it has likely been in the declaiming of those selections which typify what Paul Shorey calls "the exuberant rhetoric of the Ciceronian tradition that descends through Burke and Webster," the all-too-popular effusions of Webster, Ingersoll, and Grady. It is almost certain that he has never spoken anything of the practical business-like nature expected by this practical business-like age.

Among mature laymen, and particularly among "practical" men, there is general agreement that the style characterized as florid, ornamental, literary, rhetorical, oratorical, or what you will, is bad for modern speaking; but it persists with astonishing vigor, possibly because there is not general agreement or understanding as to what should take its place. It is the purpose of this paper to discover, if possible, what the new need is and how it should be met.

I

An attempt to analyze this change in speech style so far as it has gone, leads to the conclusion that it means, first, putting more emphasis upon reason and less upon sound and emotion. Jebb says, (Attic Orators lxxix) "The broadest characteristic of modern oratory as compared with ancient is the predominance of a sustained appeal to the understanding." It is the same thing presumably that the average American has in mind when he says modern speaking is more "practical." This surely is a desirable change if once we resign ourselves to the notion that public speaking is not a fine art whose primary end is beauty, but there is one force operating strongly to retard this change. It is well expressed by Professor Shorey when he says "florid ornament is an instinct of human nature on a certain level of culture." Men of sound sense and mature judgment are frequently willing to declaim the most absurd bombast with no concern over meaning or lack of it so long as the words roll smoothly from the tongue. It is too often true that given a choice between a flamboyant piece of rhetorical nonsense and a plainly worded bit of good sense, the student will choose the former. Burton Rascoe's recent criticism of "The Biblical Style" (New Republic, May 17, 1922) is pertinent here:

"It takes no special talent for irreverence to observe that the so-called Biblical style, nine times in ten, propounds the dubious, the false, the untrue, the bombastic, or the commonplace. Too frequently it has the specious solemnity of the C Sharp Minor Prelude, the puerile pensiveness, or the maudlin bathos of "The Face on the Barroom Floor." It soothes the fatuous ear, but it speaks little to the mind. It is an opiate, an anodyne. It brings the comfort of tears; it rests and tranquilizes; it achieves the inestimable duplicity of making the reader think he is thinking." The instinct for high sounding prose we have fostered by filling our declamation texts with specimens of it, to the exclusion of specimens of logic, reasoned argument, exact description, and critical analysis. We have drawn from epideiktic rather than from forensic or deliberative speeches, quite regardless of the fact that our students will not be called upon as young men, if ever at all, to deliver funeral orations. Our favorite selections from Lincoln are the Gettysburg Address and the Second Inaugural. We pass by the less beautiful but more logical debates with Douglas. We need not endorse H. L. Mencken's recent criticism of the Gettysburg Address, though there is merit in his warning that we should "not forget that it is oratory, not logic; beauty, not sense." Much can be done to encourage the modern trend toward more sense in speaking, even if that means less beauty.

The next characteristic of modern speaking, as Jebb sees it, is "a presumption that the speech is extemporary." Curzon speaks also of "the estimation in which extempore as distinct from prepared oratory is now held." This again means an emphasis upon forensic and deliberative speaking as opposed to epideiktic. Let it be conceded that epideiktic speaking still has its place. We may even grant that it is the highest form of speaking. The point here is that its style is essentially different from the style of extemporaneous speaking. The typical epideiktic piece is carefully written out in the study and memorized for delivery, or read. Its composition is not affected by the presence of an audience. Its style is, as Aristotle said, more literary. Indeed, the difference between extemporaneous and oratorical style is essentially the difference between oral and written style. Just what that difference is we need to try to discover. No attempt will be made here to point out the causes that make speaking different from writing, or the things one may convey in speaking that he cannot so well convey

in writing. That has already been done (with admirable thoroughness) by Professor Woolbert (*Q. J. S. E.* VIII, 271). The aim of this paper is rather to trace the effect of such factors upon style, and point out some methods whereby teachers may adjust their teaching technique and students may adopt their composition to the modern fashion.

II

Two methods of studying public speaking have been so long and so widely used as to be standard. One is the study and imitation of models, the other the study of principles derived from those models.

Where, then, shall one look for models of extemporary speech style that are worthy of imitation? The answer is not easy. We shall not find it in "that quaint mixture of Bowery slang and sophomoric declamation," quoting Professor Shorey again, "that too often passes for eloquence in Congress today." The same characterization applies to much that is current on the chautauqua platform. There must be somewhere a happy medium between the slangy "pep" talk of the modern go-getter and the sonorous profundities and thought-numbing periods of the old style declamation. But where?

There has probably been no more powerful spontaneous public utterance in English than that which characterized the golden age of British eloquence during the last half of the 18th century. Chatham and Fox especially, and in a lesser degree, Grattan, Burke, and Erskine afford examples of extemporaneous style which in spite of their 150-year-old idiom are well worth imitation today. It is curious indeed that almost the only selection from Chatham to get into our declamation books is that highly artificial piece of rhetoric known as his "Reply to Walpole," which was reported from memory by Doctor Johnson, of all men the least likely to preserve the characteristic dash and energy of Chatham's best manner. We may be thankful that other speeches of Chatham were better reported. Fox we have almost entirely neglected, possibly because of his freely expressed opinion that "if a speech read well it must have been a d — d bad speech." Burke's speeches have been so universally condemned for their literary style (from Hazlitt down to Woolbert) that it is probably useless to point out the many passages, especially in his earlier efforts, that are quite free from objectionable literary finish.

In American eloquence the Lincoln-Douglas debates, reported with scrupulous accuracy, furnish excellent examples of speaking that is largely spontaneous in composition, and that appeals to the common sense rather than the aesthetic sense of the audience. (Incidentally it needs to be pointed out that we can learn at least as much from Douglas as from Lincoln.) Here again, curiously, the only well-known portion is Lincoln's "House divided against itself" passage, which is purely literary in style, having been carefully written down in advance and first read in public and later memorized. Of the other older American speakers Phillips and Curtis come to mind. Phillips has about him the indisputable air of reality, but his trick of compressing a whole history into a single sentence, often into an illustration or metaphor; his tendency to personify or rather dramatize (for a brief instance, "Europe shouted 'Madmen!' and gave us forty years for the shipwreck"); his vivid, flashing metaphor, wealth of allusion, short sentences, and brilliant turns of expression, together with an undercurrent of great energy, give his style a glitter and dash that is very stimulating but often also confusing. In Curtis the frequency and variety of allusion and vast erudition ought to prove inspiring, but too often, unfortunately, they only irritate and mystify the modern student. Of more recent speakers, Roosevelt is certainly to be preferred, from the point of view here discussed, to Bryan and Wilson.

If one seeks usable declamations and insists besides, as one should, upon content which a present-day student might appropriately speak to a present day audience, the search will be long indeed. Issues discussed by most of the speakers here mentioned are long since dead. Those of Curtis and Roosevelt in some measure survive. Beyond these we shall have to seek materials in the occasional utterances of relatively unknown speakers, or in magazine articles which may chance to be written in the oral style. The collection and publication of a considerable number of such declamations would be a meritorious service to the cause of sane speech. The few selections included by Winans and Shurter in their texts on Public Speaking are a good beginning.

III

If we examine critically speeches of the type here discussed, especially the great masterpieces of British parliamentary eloquence, what stylistic peculiarities are evident that make them different from literary or essay composition? That is, how does

oral differ from written style? Here is a problem that is practically untouched in all the literature of rhetorical criticism. Aristotle discusses it briefly, Hazlitt glances at it, the numerous "rhetorics of oratory," such as those by Phelps and Shurter, consider it, but do not make a distinction between oratorical and extemporaneous style, and the only comprehensive discussion of it known to the writer is that by John M. Clapp in his introduction to Harding's *American Orations*.

It would seem quite obvious that one of the first characteristics of oral as opposed to written style is its *informality*. If composition is spontaneous, the speaker's style will lack finish and the audience will expect it to lack finish. It need not be crude or faulty, but it should have that conversational genuineness which is the antithesis of artifice. Just how will this informality be evidenced in style? First, diction will be simple. The speaker will use such words as come to him readily. Dispute as to their length or origin is futile if not nonsensical. They will be the words that are immediately accessible within his speaking vocabulary. A *writer* may select more carefully because at leisure. If a speaker does not find at once the right word for his idea, he uses whatever word comes to him, and then repeats his attempt at expression until the idea does break through in words that satisfy him. The writer, too, searches till he finds the proper word, but having found it, he obliterates the trail of his search and presents only the finished expression to his reader. This struggle for expression may be a fault, but it is often also an asset in that it holds the attention of the audience and helps them to think with the speaker. A speaker needs, of course, a *copia verborum*, but even good speakers sometimes find their vocabularies not sufficiently copious.

Second, this informality of oral style will affect sentence structure. Few of us converse in flawless sentences, and public speaking is but an enlarged conversation. We are prone to begin the expression of a thought before we are quite sure what the thought is. After our sentence is begun we have to throw in a parenthesis, or let a modifier trail along in an ineffective position, or we become so involved that we must start over again, or go back to pick up the main thread of our construction. Clapp's statement that sentence structure will be simple is at least open to dispute. It ought to be simple, but it *will* be only when by long training simplicity has become a habit. As a matter of fact, sentence structure

even in good speaking is often weak and aimlessly involved. An illustration may be taken from Lloyd George, who is not exactly a master of English (Speech at Glasgow, June 29, 1917):

"I would counsel those who criticise the measures we have taken to mobilize the strength of this country—strong measures, ruthless measures, if you will, interfering measures, if you will, but measures which will accomplish your purpose—I would counsel those who criticise, therefore, the measures we have taken in mobilizing the strength of this country to dwell upon the catastrophe—I repeat it, the catastrophe—that would have befallen the free democracies throughtout the world if we had not done so."

Here is another from Burke who *was* a master of English:

"I remember that the noble Lord on the floor—not in a former debate, to be sure (it would be disorderly to refer to it—I suppose I read it somewhere)—but the noble Lord was pleased to say that he did not conceive how it could enter into the head of man to impose such taxes as those of 1767 (I mean those taxes which *he* voted for imposing and voted for repealing) as being taxes contrary to all the principles of commerce, laid on British manufactures."

We may contrast with these the elegant Johnsonian sentences of Junius or the smooth-flowing periods of Burke's later writings. It is not implied that the sentences quoted above are *good*. They are decidedly *bad*, but a Johnsonian perfection is also bad. The desirable qualities are naturalness and spontaneity.

A third phase of this informality of speech may be a looseness of plan. Good speeches, and especially extemporaneous speeches, are often structurally inferior to good essays. While a speaker may have a plan, ought indeed to have a plan, he must be ready to adjust it to any exigency that may arise. He is subject to interruption and must be able to adapt his pre-arranged materials to any emergency.

A second characteristic of oral style is that it is *communicative*. The auditors are real and present, the speaker's purpose concerns them directly, and his style consequently will have all the indications of direct address. What are these indications? First, the use of interrogation. Of course interrogation is not peculiar to oral style. It occurs in the soliloquies of Hamlet, Falstaff, and Launcelot Gobbo. But in public speaking the question is thrown at the audience, and it is used much more frequently. Five or six questions often occur in succession. Fox's speeches bristle with in-

terrogation marks. In one of Burke's paragraphs 19 sentences are interrogatory, 4 are exclamatory, and only 3 are declarative. And generally the speaker's questions are not mere speculations. They either demand or suggest an answer which the hearer is to supply. This passage from Chatham is typical:

"Will this increase your number of seamen? or will it make those you have more willing to serve you? Can you expect that any man will make himself a slave if he can avoid it? Can you expect that any man will breed his child up to be a slave? Can you expect that seamen will venture their lives or their limbs for a country that has made them slaves?"

Often the speaker supplies the hearer's answer using a form of colloquy, as in this passage from Burke:

"But are the journals which say nothing of the revenue as silent on the discontent? Oh no! A child may find it. It is the melancholy burden and blot of every page."

Or this from Fox:

"But, sir, the High Bailiff was threatened—and how? Was it by threats of assaulting him? No. Was it by holding up the fear of danger to him by mobs or riots? No." etc.

A second indication of this communicative quality of speech is a liberal use of the second personal pronoun, and other marks of direct address. Note this example from Burke:

"Cannot you in England, cannot you at this time of day, cannot you—a House of Commons—trust to the principle which has raised so mighty a revenue, and accumulated a debt of one hundred and forty millions in this country?"

In one paragraph of 27 lines following this the word *you* occurs 11 times. Of nine consecutive paragraphs taken at random from a speech of Chatham's, seven have in the first sentence the word of address, *sir*. On a typical page of one of Chatham's speeches the term, *My Lords* or *Your Lordships* occurs 18 times. It should be remembered that parliamentary decorum frowned upon direct address, except to the chair and that the "honorable gentlemen" addressed were spoken to usually in the third person.

Good public speech is intensely *personal*. Ideas are not shot into the air to be gathered in by whoever happens to pass by. They are aimed at a target and carefully winged that they may be sure to arrive. And just as persons *receive* the impact of ideas, so a person draws the bow and directs the aim. A speaker does not

merely announce truths or state maxims; he drives them forward with the force of his will. The speaker's presence, appearance, manner, voice are all used to give color and weight to what he says. As Clapp says, "speaking has more *will* in it;" and this will is *projected.* It does not take the form of a mere announcement as in Henley's famous lyric:

I am the master of my fate.

I am the captain of my soul.

He might have shouted that on a desert island; it is purely lyrical, that is, subjective. In contrast note this instance from Chatham:

"I love and honor the English troops. I know their virtues and their valor. I know they can achieve anything except impossibilities; and I know that the conquest of English America *is an impossibility.* You cannot, I venture to say it, *you cannot conquer America.* Your armies' last war effected everything that could be effected; and what was it?" etc.

Here is the will of one man working upon the wills of others. The orator speaks often as one having authority. Ideas are not his only weapons; his very personality is one of them. He must not try to sink himself out of sight. Impersonality may be an ideal in a text on philosophy or science. It is not an ideal in persuasion or debate. In oral far more than in written discourse the personality is injected into the style and composition. Chatham, for instance, refers repeatedly to the state of his health and tells how he thought his presence in the house so important that he rose from a bed of pain to be present. Fox "stakes his all" on the character of his East India bill. A speaker is not afraid of the pronoun "I." Of 34 consecutive sentences in Fox's speech on the Westminister Scrutiny all but four contain this pronoun. Speaking full of the "I to you" quality, is, in fine, conversational or communicative. A final example follows (from Lincoln's Cooper Union Address) which might well serve as a model for every beginner in practical speech.

"You say we are sectional. We deny it. That makes an issue; and the burden of proof is upon you. You produce your proof; and what is it? Why that our party has no existence in your section—gets no votes in your section. The fact is substantially true; but does it prove the issue? If it does, then in case we should, without change of principle, begin to get votes in your section, we

should thereby cease to be sectional. You cannot escape this conclusion; and yet are you willing to abide by it? If you are, you will probably soon find that we have ceased to be sectional, for we shall get votes in your section this very year."

This discussion of the communicative quality of oral style suggests a third characteristic, namely, what Clapp calls its "eagerness," its swift, vigorous movement of thought. Phelps calls it *energy* and says it grows out of having a distinct, single, immediate, and urgent object. Aristotle calls such a style agonistic. It connotes struggle. There is opposition to be overcome, hence, force is needed. Audiences are not easily moved. A speaker must have warmth and enthusiasm or his hearers will remain cold. This energy or eagerness of spoken discourse will show itself in several ways: first, in a certain conciseness and precision of language, a lopping off of all unnecessary words, phrases, or figures. Conjunctions are often dispensed with.

Here is a bad sentence from Premier Asquith's speech in Parliament justifying the declaration of war upon Germany:

"There is no man amongst us sitting on this bench in these trying days—more trying perhaps than any body of statesmen for a hundred years have had to pass through—there is not a man amongst us who has not, during the whole of that time, had clearly before his vision the almost unequalled suffering which war, even in a just cause, must bring about, not only to the people who are for the moment living in this country and in the other countries of the world, but to posterity and to the whole prospect of European civilization."

Here is a quite evident lack of precision, force, and directness. Perhaps the energetic Chatham would have worded it something like this:

"We know the sufferings that war entails. The horror of that suffering has been with us through all these trying days. There is not a man on this bench who has not felt it. We know what war means to our country and to others, to our age and to posterity. We know what it means to the whole prospect of European civilization."

Of course informality is somewhat opposed to energy; but the two can be in some measure harmonized, especially since energy prefers the use of short sentences, or clauses with few modifiers. Energy discourages the use of subordinate clauses or complex sen-

tences, and prefers always that clauses be linked together in obvious relationships. Iteration is frequent and often runs into climax. There is occasional effective use of periodic sentence structure. Here is a typical bit of Chatham's energetic style:

"The river of Lisbon in the possession of our enemies! The seas swept by American privateers! Our channel trade torn to pieces by them! In this complicated crisis of danger, weakness at home, and calamity abroad, terrified and insulted by the neighboring powers, unable to act in America, or acting only to be destroyed, where is the man with the forehead to promise or hope for success in such a situation, or from perseverance in the measures that have driven us to it? Who has the forehead to do so? Where is that man? I should be glad to see his face."

Here is an example from Fox:

"And all this without an intelligible motive. All this because you may gain a better peace a year or two hence. So that we are called upon to go on merely as a speculation. We must keep Bonaparte for some time longer at war as a state of probation. Gracious God, sir! Is war a state of probation? Is peace a rash system? Is it dangerous for nations to live in amity with each other?"

There is one more important characteristic of oral style. It must convey meaning with *unmistakable plainness.* A speech from its very nature must have immediate intelligibility. One may *read* a sentence twice if its meaning is not clear, but one can seldom stop a speaker and have him repeat a sentence. If a thought is a little difficult for his audience, the speaker must recognize that fact and employ some means to make it clear. He may repeat it, he may break it into smaller portions, he may use an analogy, an illustration, or a metaphor or other figure. He will favor the concrete over the abstract and the familiar over the precise word. But, whatever the means, his style *must* be clear. Consequently it will often have a diffusiveness which will tend to check energy. The need for amplification will prevent conciseness. The speaker must learn to find the proper mean between a tautological diffuseness and an obscure conciseness. Almost any unprepared school boy illustrates the former fault. Emerson, Meredith, and sometimes Curtis and Phillips illustrate the latter.

Here is an impossible sentence from one of Burke's letters:

"It might have been expected, that emulous of the glory of the youthful hero in alliance with him, touched by the example of

what one man, well formed and well placed may do in the most desperate state of affairs, convinced that there is a courage of the cabinet fully as powerful, and far less vulgar than that of the field, our minister would have changed the whole line of that unprosperous prudence, which hitherto had produced all the effects of the blindest temerity."

This has the oratorical roll and periodic structure that many admire, but its meaning does not immediately emerge. It may lull the senses, but it hardly touches the understanding. "Unprosperous prudence" and "blindest temerity" sound well, but what do they mean?

Here is another example from Burke at his best. It is diffuse, but its meaning is unmistakably plain.

"Sir, they took *no* middle line. They differed fundamentally from the schemes of both parties, but they preserved the objects of both. They preserved the authority of Great Britain. They preserved the equity of Great Britain. They made the Declaratory Act. They repealed the Stamp Act. They did both *fully;* because the Declaratory Act was without qualification, and the repeal of the Stamp Act total. This they did in the situation I have described."

One would hardly expect to find such a passage in an essay.

These, then, seem to be the chief qualities that distinguish oral from written style: It is more *informal,* more *communicative,* more *personal,* more *energetic,* more *perspicuous.* In all these respects it differs from the style of Websterian profundity, the style of Biblical sonority, and the style of Johnsonian perfection. Of course all these manners have their appropriate uses in modern life, but students of practical public speaking should be made to realize that in practical public speech—speech whose aim is communication of ideas, not display of powers—they have no place.

Textbooks on rhetoric, from Aristotle down, give liberal space to the figurative and harmonious qualities of speech style, but there seems to be no warrant for the inclusion of ornament and harmony as *distinctive* features of oral style as here defined. In common with other qualities not here mentioned they are found in all good prose, and they are probably less valuable in plain practical speech than in any other type of composition. If it be objected that this violates the previously accepted canons of taste and excellence, the answer is that that style is best which best serves the function of the speech, that we are discussing here speech that appeals to

the understanding rather than to the emotions, that is, the aesthetic emotions, and that ornament and rhythm tend to cloud the understanding, though they do possibly give pleasure to the hearer. Curzon goes so far as to say that they are now regarded with a mixture of suspicion and amused surprise. Perhaps it will be safest to place them in the same category in which Professor Bain placed kissing: if allowed at all, the occasion should be adequate and the actuality rare.

COURSES FOR THE FEW OR FOR THE MANY

WILLIAM HAWLEY DAVIS
Bowdoin College

THE alternative which a member of the program committee proposed to me for discusssion at the New York Convention, would, I believe, never have originated had it not been for the determination of certain of our forbears to establish "free schools." Statistics show, I am informed, that over half of the non-infant population of the world cannot read or write; yet we teachers taking counsel together concerning some aspects of secondary and higher education in America, are perplexed by the question as to whether or not our efforts should be applied to all or only to certain of the pupils in the institutions we are connected with; and this when our particular branch is demonstrably less indispensable than the reading, writing, and arithmetic which constituted the minimum, almost the maximum, content of the free school education desired by our forbears. Every person must be encouraged, induced, compelled to learn to read and write; with a consummation short of that our American heritage prevents us forever from being content. But shall high school and college courses in speech or public speaking be required of or framed for the average, or for a selected college student?

The prevalent and agitating question as to who should go to college (or to high school) has a bearing upon our special query; but is not identical with it. Would ideal free schools provide opportunity for every embryo citizen to be educated up to the point at least of receiving an A. B. or a B. S. degree? Shall Anglo-

Saxon, calculus, industrial chemistry, the principles and practice of accounting, all or one of them, be made compulsory as in most states an elementary education is now compulsory? That is a problem for educational seers and engineers to apply their minds to solving, so Utopian is the point of view we are able today to adopt. And the function of the teaching of public speaking is necessarily bound up with their decision when it can be arrived at. But our immediate problem is less staggering. Having noted the relation between the larger problem and our special one, we are called upon to consider merely this: of those who come to our institutions, who for years to come can attend them, shall all or some be shaped by instruction into beings capable of functioning as public speakers?

An element in the situation still further simplifies the problem. Notwithstanding the great influx of students at present embarrassing our so-called higher institutions of learning, these students are still selected individuals, persons who on the basis of their survival in a genuine struggle obtaining up to and within the doors of these institutions are likely to include the leaders of the coming generation. Must these winning strugglers through either prescription or heavy educational pressure, these leaders *in posse*, be trained willynilly to speak?

Our present educational practice presents at once a useful analogy. Among our vast elective possibilities, courses in English Composition (you may prefer the more inclusive term, English) are commonly, almost universally, required of all students in institutions of more than grammar school grade. If these courses are not adapted to the many rather than the few, something is wrong with them; they must be improved in the direction of wider adaptation. Now, shall speech instruction approximate required English courses in its aims, or shall it approximate existing courses, say, in forestry or sanitation or ballistics?

This association has already implied an answer to the query by going on record as favoring a college entrance requirement in speech or speaking. The significance of that action is not altogether plain, but it appears to favor courses for the many, and regarding it as not irretrievable we shall do well to reflect upon it a moment. One's attitude on the question of a speech requirement for admission is naturally determined in a large measure by the minimum standard of excellence which it is proposed to adopt. My own ob-

servations and the expressions of other college teachers which I read, lead me to believe that if the standard is at all corresponding to that in English composition, few candidates will be rejected. I might press the correspondence further and state that in order to produce in a course for the many improvements in speech merely equivalent to that produced in composition by freshman English courses (I teach one myself!), a speech course of very moderate content would suffice. But the comparison quickly becomes odious.

The question we are discussing, after all, I submit concerns not alone a possible required freshman course in speech training, though it may certainly include that, but also the attitude and aim to be observed in all courses in speaking. Is effectiveness in speaking to be regarded by college-trained persons as an inalienable right or as a peculiar gift?

I must confess without further delay that I incline to the latter view. Useful and salutary as trained excellence in speaking on the part of every college graduate would be, I do not feel that our courses fail in proportion as they train less than all; nor do I regard that course as necessarily the best which attracts the largest voluntary enrollment or moulds to a common high type the largest number of students. In speech, as in composition courses, conditions are such that again and again gifted persons will perform notable services, achieve perhaps the greatest laurels, without our aid, perhaps joyously conscious that they are doing so. And if, recognizing fitness for effective speaking as a talent, a gift, we can now and then discover and spur a five-talent or three-talent genius, and can quite regularly induce the one-talent ones to put out their funds to usury and not bury them in napkins, we should, I submit, be content. To distribute decimal talents where before there were virtually none, seems to me not among the obligations resting upon us.

I reject, in other words, the idea that advanced institutional education is the prerogative of every youthful citizen. I believe that for the last few decades we have erred in placing the gold medal premium upon an A. B. or a B. S. degree rather than upon the having developed one's native capacity, the having utilized one's natural gifts. Among my non-college friends I recognize many for whose lack of a more advanced education the world is poorer. I sadly note among those who achieve diplomas not a few who have pretty certainly been misguided into pursuing a training

for which they were not really fitted. The educational generation which in the heat of enrollment-rivalry preached broadcast the doctrine, "College is good; come to college," has, on a day when words are weighed, much to answer for.

"Can you contrive to pass our requirements? Shouldn't you like to share our fun? See what fame and wealth our graduates secure (A slap on the back!) Come on!"—At high school commencements, in official "literature," and even through trained undergraduate "rooters," isn't that the burden of the appeal our institutions have been making? It is the method of barkers on a midway.

Far-sighted employers in business and industry are wiser. Like the college they proclaim, "Opportunity is here"; but they add, "for the right man." Then they scrutinize the applicant's interests, his principles, his promise. Has the development of higher education really been such that corresponding tests might not have been imposed: Are you adapted to this field of human endeavor? Have you not merely a mild willingness to undertake, but a real passion for, those things to provide which in our society a college exists? Is this your line? A beckoning world, abundance of opportunity, lies all about you. You are no longer an irresponsible child—is this peculiar opportunity the one in which your experience hitherto leads you to believe that you will find satisfaction?

You teachers know the results. Our classrooms, except in advanced elective courses, show perhaps the most pathetic results of all. The towering structure of undergraduate activities, such that study actually interferes with "college life," shows the tragic results. And occasionally even thoughtful educators deceive themselves at least momentarily into admitting that these results are desirable.

The application of all this to the question of public speaking courses for the few or the many must be plain. To begin with, our speaking courses owe nothing to an individual, however fine his voice or pleasing his stage presence, who has been misled into pursuing higher education. Of those properly collegiate many, I believe most, deserve some training. I believe that in the conduct of the complex affair we call our civilization much helpful information, much constructive thinking, remains unvoiced. Time and again it is demonstrated that we do not prefer "hot air," dema-

goguery; only, most unfortunately, the man who knows sits silent. The ranks before us in our classrooms more and more certainly comprise the men who know. We can furnish them elementary practice in telling what they know and in forming the habit of doing this in a manner appropriate to the occasion confronting them. There is ample reason for proclaiming today the public duty of educated men; and a part of their duty is now and then out of their education effectively to speak. I conceive these to be one-talent men. Courses designed in a direct, unpretentious way to perform for many students this function of a college should, I believe, be maintained. The pomp of stage or platform would in them be superfluous, memorized speeches would certainly be taboo, and Websterian grace and fervor would not be considered essential, hardly ideal. Other pedagogical features it is surely unnecessary to enumerate here.

There remain to be considered the students possessing along with other distinguishing, leaderlike qualities, a patent or latent gift of speech. These are the persons with talents. Some of them, perhaps regularly the most talented, will evade the most profitable and attractive course in speaking which can be maintained; for that one possesses certain knowledge or ability is unanswerable as a reason for avoiding instruction concerned with it. These persons are almost certain to function as speakers. Their chief danger concerns delay or inefficiency in the earlier exercise of their talents. Attract all of these students that you can—that is my counsel. Get them together, reveal them to each other and to themselves, get each one's light out from under his particular bushel as promptly and as securely as possible. Anticipate at least the first few fruitless occasions when he is finding himself, and send him from your institution able to function more promptly and more thoroughly at the moment of his departure than he might have done had he not taken work with you.

But don't offer him advanced training adapted to the many! Don't above all things fit him, Procrustes-like, into some bed or mould that you have fashioned. He is a man. He must be trained as *one*, not even as one of a few. He is in many ways the fine flower of civilization, and ever a crying need is for him. Fortunate the institution and happy the teacher to whom such a man can fairly attribute something of what he is on account of courses that he took in college.

RESEARCH PAPERS IN PROCESS OR LATELY FINISHED

COMPILED BY THE COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH
H. A. Wichelns, University of Pittsburgh, Chairman

THE following list is as complete as the returns received allow. It does not include the papers listed in the JOURNAL for last June, pp. 235–240.

SPEECH CORRECTION AND VOICE SCIENCE

Anderson, Lewis O. An Experimental Analysis of Causes of Stuttering. (Ph. D. thesis in psychology at University of Wisconsin under Professor C. L. Hull, Director of Psychological Laboratory, and Professor Blanton; finished; preliminary report published in *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. V, December, 1921; to be published as a Psychological Monograph.) A series of tests was worked out to discover some of the fundamental causes of stuttering. The tests were designed to reveal the emotional reactions and muscular coördinations of those suffering from speech disorders.

Harker, Myra S. A Comparison of the Emotional Reactions of an Unselected Group of University Students with those of a Group of Students having Speech Defects. (A. M. thesis in speech at University of Wisconsin, under Professor Blanton; unfinished.) A study to find out whether normal people have the same emotional difficulties as those who suffer from speech disorders.

Hedrick, Jennie. The Range of the Speaking Voice. (Special study; unfinished.) The object of the inquiry is to provide a scale for the guidance of teachers in developing expression in the voices of the deaf, the feeble-minded, or those who through lack of hearing or perception of musical tones are unable to modulate their own voices. The aim is to find a norm in the speech of young children, young persons, and adults of various ages; and to mark the differences in range caused by age, nationality, profession, emotions and pathological condition. The scope of the inquiry demands the coöperation of a number

of persons who are willing to gather minute and reliable data and to make accurate reports.

Norvelle, L. R. An Experimental Study of Effective Voice Elements in Speech. (A. M. thesis at Iowa State University; finished; published, June, 1923, at Iowa City.) A standard was developed by the experiments and used by 1092 subjects. Data were compiled, graphed, and interpreted.

Scripture, May K. A Case of Reëducating Speech after a Cleft Palate Operation. (*American Medicine*, February, 1916.)

Rational Treatment of Stuttering. (*Laryngoscope*, February, 1917; a continuation is in preparation.)

Stammering—a Responsibility. (*Laryngoscope*, August, 1917.)

Stuttering and Stammering. (*Laryngoscope*, March, 1918; another paper under this title appeared in the JOURNAL, April, 1922.)

An Attempt to Determine another Etiological Cause of Stuttering through Objective Measurements. (In collaboration with Winifred Kittredge; published in *Journal of Educational Psychology*, March, 1923.)

Etiology of Speech Defects. (*Laryngoscope*, July, 1918.)

Diagnosis of Speech Defects. (*Laryngoscope*, February, 1918.)

Phonetics in Relation to Speech Defects. (*Laryngoscope*, October, 1918.)

Therapy of Speech Defects. (*Laryngoscope*, November, 1918.)

Speech Conflict. (*Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases*, January and February, 1918.)

Aphasia. (*Laryngoscope*, May, 1918.)

Abnormal Voices, Nasality, etc. (*Laryngoscope*, July, 1918.)

Lefthandedness as an Etiological Factor in Speech Defects. (In collaboration with Glogau and Debra; published in *Laryngoscope*, March, 1917.)

Correct Speech. (Published by Iowa State University, 1916.)

Negligent Speech. (*Laryngoscope*, January, 1919.)

Study of Posture as an Aid to Speech Training. (In preparation.)

Mental Stimulus for the Mentally Retarded through Speech Training. (In preparation.)

Clinical Data to Determine Accurate Percentage of Males' and Females' Defects of Speech. (In preparation.)

Stivers, Charles G. Aphasia: Reëducation of a Case; with kine-

matographs. (Paper read before American Medical Association, June, 1923.) Treatment by suggestion (autosuggestion) to dispel fear; by reëducation, oral practice, breathing, auditory practice. Use of pictures as models for patients and teachers in similar cases.

Young, Adelbert. A Study of Speech Defects as a Psychiatric Problem. (A. B. thesis in speech at University of Wisconsin under Professor Blanton; unfinished.) Survey of speech defects in school children in one of the towns of Wisconsin. Study of the nervous difficulties of the children and an attempt to determine whether the best method of treatment is a reorganization and reëducation of the emotional life, coupled with training in meeting various situations by means of speech.

PSYCHOLOGICAL THEORY OF EXPRESSION

Kimball, Emily A. The Use and Abuse of Appeals to Human Drives in Persuasion. (A. M. thesis at Northwestern University under Professor Sarett; finished.)

McKay, Frederick B. The Psychology of Public Speaking. (Special study at Harvard under Professor H. S. Langfeld; finished; published in *American Schoolmaster,* March, 1923.) A study of appeals to the fundamental instincts and sentiments of individuals as members of audience-crowds, and of the ways in which three American public speakers illustrate these appeals.

Strickler, Donald W. A Survey of the Literature in the Field of Emotions, in Relation to Speech. (A. M. thesis at Northwestern University under Professor Sarett.)

Yeager, Hayes. Action and the Impelling Motives. (A. M. thesis at Ohio State University, under Professor Ketcham; unfinished.) Using the impelling motives of Phillips as a basis, the writer will try to determine why in a great many speeches with the end of action, and in which the impelling motives are used properly, the speaker fails to obtain the desired action; the work is largely being carried on by personal interviews with speakers.

SPEECH COMPOSITION: RHETORIC

Bauer, Marvin. Development of Lincoln's Rhetorical Practice. (A. M. thesis at Cornell under Professor Drummond; unfinished.)

Colcord, Marian L. The Poetics of Aristotle and the Rhetoric Related. (A. M. thesis at Cornell under Professor Drummond.)

Fabian, E. S. The Place of Aristotle's Rhetoric in his System of Thought. (A. M. thesis at Cornell under Professor Drummond.)

Hannah, Robert. Edmund Burke the Rhetorician. (A. M. thesis at Cornell under Professor Drummond; finished; not published.) This is an attempt to test a modern classic by the principles of the ancient rhetoricians. The work is largely confined to the principles of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* and to the opening speech against Hastings; other works of Burke are drawn upon for illustration. The thesis is divided as follows: Burke's audience; the character of the man, or the ethical proof; motivation in the life and speeches of Burke generally; motivation in the opening speech against Hastings; Burke's style; analysis of the opening speech; conclusions therefrom; synopsis.

Hudson, Hoyt H. Rhetorical Theory and Practice in England, 1500-1700. (Special study at Cornell under Professor Drummond; unfinished.) A study of rhetorical text-books and discussions of the period, with special reference to speaking rather than to writing; the study of speaking in the schools, with theories of delivery, and pedagogical methods followed; the amount and kinds of speaking done by public men and preachers; conventional addresses employed on certain occasions; the principal speakers of the period, examined with reference to their education and methods of speech preparation, as well as with reference to occasions, purposes, and results of speeches.

Hultzén, Lee S. A Translation of Selected Parts of A. E. Chaignet's *La Rhetorique et son Histoire*. (A. M. thesis at Cornell under Professor Drummond; unfinished.) Chaignet's work is a treatise on classical rhetoric, with some application to modern conditions, for the most part based on Aristotle's Rhetoric, but taking into account most of the classical works.

Ingraham, Dora V. Translation of such Parts as have Particular Interest to Students and Teachers of Speech of *Conseils Sur L'Art D'Ecrire* by Gustave Lanson. (A. B. thesis, in speech, at University of Wisconsin under Professor West; unfinished.)

Parrish, W. M. Rhythm of Oratorical Prose. (A. M. thesis at

Cornell under Professor Drummond; finished.) A review of all utterances known to the writer on the rhythm of prose, with some conclusions as to its function and frequency.

Rousseau, Lousene G. A Study of the Use of Figurative Language in Selected Speeches. (Special study at University of Wisconsin under Professor O'Neill; unfinished.) Figures of speech in rhetoric and oratory as contrasted with poetry; analysis of figures found in 95 model speeches; classification according to kinds of figures, types of speeches, purposes of speeches, emotional development of speeches, with diagrams and tables; comparison of various orators in respect of their use of figures.

Smith, Bromley. Corax and Probability. (Published in the JOURNAL, February, 1921.) A contribution to the history of rhetoric, in which the beginnings of the subject are set down. After showing the definitions of rhetoric and the first attempts at outlines for speeches, the general principle of probability is discussed.

Prodicus of Ceos: The Sire of Synonomy. (Published in the JOURNAL, April, 1920.) Students of speech are interested in problems of vocabulary. Herein is shown how synonyms were differentiated; how a store of words may be increased. An attempt to define accurately the meaning of words is shown to be fruitless and even dangerous.

Gorgias: A Study of Oratorical Style. (Published in the JOURNAL, *November*, 1921.) This is a detailed study of oratorical style, centered about the fragment of an oration by Gorgias, with something of a new approach. There is enough of modern instance to interest one who is not versed in Greek. Rhetoricians will find a discussion of the periodic sentence as used by orators.

The Father of Debate: Protagoras of Abdera. (Published in the JOURNAL, March, 1918.) This study assembles the facts concerning the origin of courses in argumentation and the relation of argument to public and private life. The beginnings of grammar and of diction are noted. The charge that arguing for victory is immoral is discussed, from both ancient and modern points of view.

Thomas, C. K. The Rhetorical Practice of Charles James Fox.

(A. M. thesis at Cornell under Professor Drummond; unfinished.)

Wallace, Francis D. Rhetorical Theories of British Orators of the Eighteenth Century. (A. M. thesis under joint direction of the department of English of the University of Maine and Professor Drummond of Cornell.)

Utterback, William E. Principles of Speech-Construction. (A. M. thesis at Dartmouth College under Professor Winans; unfinished.) An attempt to draw from modern psychology a body of principles which will systematize and explain the collection of rules and devices that now make up the bulk of available instruction in rhetoric or speech-construction.

HISTORY OF ORATORY

Layton, Charles R. The Oratory of John Bright—A Critical Analysis of its Political Contribution and Influence. (Ph. D. thesis at University of Michigan under Professor Trueblood for public speaking and Dr. J. S. Reeves for political science; unfinished.) The thesis will cover, roughly, the man and his public service; his speeches, content, style, delivery; his influence upon political and economic thought and action; his political and economic theory; his contribution to political theory and practice.

Olander, Hallie B. Ward. A Tabular Survey of Orators and Rhetoricians, 600 A. D. to 1800. (Special study at University of Wisconsin under Professor O'Neill; unfinished.) This survey aims to present in tabular form a list of the orators and rhetoricians from 600 A. D. to 1800, showing names, dates, localities, schools, teachers, pupils and contributors, with all data keyed to a bibliography to indicate the authorities for all the information presented.

Wenzelmann, Ruth N. A Tabular Survey of Orators and Rhetoricians, 1000 B. C. to 600 A. D. (Identical with that of Mrs. Olander, above, except for period dealt with.)

READING AND DRAMATICS

Buehler, E. C. The Creation of Atmosphere by the Reader. (A. M. thesis at Northwestern University, under Professor Dennis; finished.)

Hendrickson, Hilda. Women's Activities in the Field of Dramatic

Production. (A. B. thesis in speech, at University of Wisconsin, under Professor Gertrude E. Johnson; finished; not published.) A discussion, based on an extensive study from the early English period through 1922, with a tabulation chart.

Mooney, Reverend E. Vincent. The Parish Theater Movement. (A. M. thesis, at Catholic University of America, in the department of sociology; finished.) Purpose: to show that the parish theater as an institution has existed for years; that as a socializing factor in community life it has exercised a very marked influence. It is the author's belief that the parish theater has contributed more than any other factor to the maintenance of the amateur ideal.

McCarthy, Margaret Mary. The Origin and Development of Comedy. (Special topic for graduate student in course in dramatic production, under Professor Gertrude E. Johnson; finished; not yet published.) A study based on discussions of comedy from Aristotle and Aristophanes through Moliére and Corneille.

Paul, Vera Alice. Imperfection of Character as a Comedy Element. (A. M. thesis, at University of Iowa, under Professor Mabie; finished; published, February, 1921, Iowa City, Iowa.) The study is based on one hundred plays much used for productions in high schools. The imperfections or defects of character were classified and arranged in an ascending scale from the grosser, more objective ones, as physical defects like deafness, to the more subtle ones, such as moral defections and ignorance of common social conventions. Tables were made showing the number of times a given imperfection appeared in each play, the sum in all the plays, and the grand total. From these, graphs were made for each play. Conclusions reached: Imperfection of character is a strong comedy element. Plays fall into distinct classes as regards predominance of certain defects. Predominance of imperfections is not a basis for evaluation, but serves as an eliminary measure.

Reeid, N. E. Qualifications of Play Directors. (Special study at American Academy of Dramatic Arts; to be published in January, 1924, by Longmans, Green and Co.

Sturgis, Granville Forbes. Influence of the Drama. (A. M. thesis at University of Denver, under Ida Kruse McFarlane; finished;

published, but out of print.) A brief outline of the development of the drama, with an extensive index of plays and of dates of presentation.

The Psychology of Maeterlinck. (Ph. D. thesis at University of Denver, under Professor Daniel E. Phillips; finished; published by Badger.) This book reduces to their simplest terms the underlying motives and mental traits of the characters sketched in the dramas. The plays have been grouped and analyzed according to their emotions. In making the classification, Ribot's grouping of the emotions has been followed. Summaries of the plays are included in a separate portion of the book.

The Little Theater Movement. (Five lectures; not yet published.)

Wise, C. M. Dramatics for School and Community. (A. M. thesis at the University of Chicago, under direction of the department of English; finished; published by Stewart Kidd.)

GENERAL PROBLEMS AND METHODS

Baker, Elizabeth W. Investigation by means of a questionnaire to ascertain what is being done in high schools throughout the United States in spoken English. (Finished; for use in a projected book on Spoken English.)

Inquiry into what proportion of the English used in business and professional life is written, what spoken. Questionnaire sent to fifty prominent persons, mostly in a single city. (Finished. For use in the book mentioned above.)

Study of college catalogues from all states in the union to find out what courses are being given in spoken English. (Not complete.)

Case, Margaret M. Theory of Speech Training in Quintilian and Its Modern Implications. (A. M. thesis at Cornell, under Professor Drummond; not finished.)

Damon, Ruth A. A Survey of the Development of Speech Curricula of the Last Decade. (A. M. thesis at Northwestern University, under Professor Dennis; almost finished.) The survey covers thirty-five colleges and universities. We find that there is little agreement as to beginning courses either in title or in content. The terminology is most varied. The number of

courses in Interpretation has increased and then decreased to almost the 1913 level. The number in Voice and Diction has steadily increased. The number in Dramatics has increased from an average of less than one to an average of almost two. Theory exhibits no change. The number of courses in Public Speaking has increased.

Scripture, May K. Character Building Through Speech Training. (An independent study; unfinished.)

Wagner, Russell H. Method of Rhetorical Instruction in Cicero. (Special study at Cornell, under Professor Drummond; unfinished.)

EDITORIAL

RATES FOR THE CINCINNATI CONVENTION

THE Cincinnati meeting of the National Association of Teachers of Speech provides a new departure in that at this meeting we join forces with the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Notice of our program will be given in the preliminary announcement which the Secretary of the American Association issues this fall.

As a result of this arrangement we are assured, for the first time, of reduced railroad rates for our annual convention. Heretofore we have worked on conjectures which have not materialized in reduction of carfare. The number of people in attendance at the American Association for the Advancement of Science meeting, however, is a positive guarantee of sufficient numbers to secure the rates, and Secretary Burton E. Livingston of the A. A. A. S. is including our meeting with the general gathering. Secretary Livingston makes the following statement:

"We have succeeded in securing reduced railway rates for those who will attend the Cincinnati meeting from all of the United States and practically all of Canada. It will be safe for you to announce to

your members that the reduced rates are available for all persons living in the United States. Western Canada is also included but not the eastern region of that country. I am unable to give you a clear demarcation, but I imagine that you will not need it. The members of your Association will be considered as guests of A. A. A. S. on this occasion and will therefore come in for the reduced-rate privileges. The arrangement is according to what the railways call the Certificate Plan. Your members should secure a certificate for the A. A. A. S. meeting when they purchase their going tickets. They will bring their certificates to the meeting and deposit them in the registration room when they register. A day or two later these certificates may be reclaimed (having been endorsed by the Association in the meantime). They are then to be validated by a railway official who will be present at the meeting. After having been endorsed and validated the certificate will entitle the holder to purchase a continuous trip ticket for the return journey to the place from which he started, at one-half of the regular fare. Thus, the round trip will cost the member an amount equal to one and one-half times the regular one-way fare from his home to Cincinnati."

HOLDING FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD

RECENT discussion, under one subject and another, has brought out interesting data. We are becoming denominational. Rather we are at the point of allowing denominations to be revealed. That is well—or ill—as results may transpire. Cults, coteries, and sects are at least concrete evidence of a lively interest. The problem is to keep them amiable, generous, and wide-visioned.

It will be forever thus in the teaching of speaking and reading. The subject is so old that centuries contribute a wide gamut of moods, tempers, motifs, and ambitions. Also the subject is so broad and important that strong support exists for each one of the numerous branches of the family tree. All phases of our work have a fine tradition. No discipline in the whole scheme of things academic has a longer or more interesting history. This is inevitable, because man cannot live happily without control over speaking and reading. The subject began with beginnings in education and will continue as long as education is a profitable human venture.

It is natural that men of differing tastes should make different choice of emphasis among the several branches. It is as natural

also, that in so plastic a subject as speech, local pressures should shape the bent of any man's teaching. So the outcome is understandable when we find "many men of many minds," and many of them strong-minded indeed. It hardly seems conceivable that for considerable time to come we shall or can have precisely the same aims or can employ the same emphasis. Nor is it at all apparent that unanimity is even desirable.

The rebirth of speech training as a worthy academic discipline has had its travails. The subject is as old as education, but here and there is looked upon as a newcomer among our present academic disciplines. It existed before discipline was known in most of our present studies; though some of them would now crowd it out or relegate it to a secluded corner. In the recrudescence of speaking as training there is something of the effect of new wine in old bottles added to the effect of an ancient cathedral serving as a place for town meeting.

What could be more natural than that the counsels of teachers of speech should be lively affairs? Annually we bring under one roof several traditions; each of these traditions finds support in a present-day need; the members at counsel are at least moderately skilled in expressing their views; and they have proved undeniably honest in revealing and following their several bents. The result is inevitable; our discussions are vigorous and earnest.

For nine years the QUARTERLY JOURNAL has been of service in bringing out definite grounds for agreement and difference. The differences especially stand as a challenge to scholarly study, to tolerance of view, and to agreement in the future. Denominational postures will possess us each and severally. Local pressures, coupled with tastes acquired or inherited, will sway us. But by means of common meeting places and a common medium for exchange of ideas we can work out any problem and can effect any degree of unanimity of ambitions. Time has always been on the side of those who hope that tomorrow will bring something better than today.

COÖPERATION

THE National Association of Teachers of Speech is entering its tenth year of existence. For nine years it has stood as the first nation-wide organization of academic teachers of the oral use of the mother tongue. Its continued existence has made evident one

salient conclusion, that the fruits of coöperation and organization can be had in this field only by creating a mechanism of union for academic teachers. Previous attempts at organization on a national scale have come to naught through the attempt to mix the academic and the non-academic. Tempting as this amalgamation may be—and it is peculiarly so in matters of the spoken aspects of the mother tongue—experience has shown that it does not work, and the example of our sister disciplines warns against it. The values of professional coöperation can be had only by homogeneity of occupation and kinship of interests.

The need of the moment toward more effective coöperation is that our tenth year shall see more academic teachers of our subject allied in the common purposes of the Association. There are teachers, and some in prominent places, who feel happiest when working in isolation. This is a feeling entirely understandable if one were allowed to consult one's comfort only. But education in America, both in schools and in colleges, has passed the cloister stage. The scientist is unquestionably happiest sequestered in his laboratory; also the literary man in his library. But the recluse and the hermit is no longer the type of teacher and scholar. Nor is the traditional stage pedagogue with his social ineptitudes and even boorishness any longer honored and sought out. Education has become socialized. The scientist leaves his laboratory, the man of letters his books, and mingles with his fellows in the give and take of common association. This way he keeps himself human, escapes some of his crotchets, and learns that the universe does not resolve around his classroom or his cell.

All this commonplace is uttered now because historically no subject in the curriculum lends itself more to one-man views, vagaries, and idiosyncratic emphasis than speaking, reading, and the dramatic arts. The subject is the oldest in the catagory of scholastic learning; it has the longest and richest tradition; it is perennially vital and interesting. In one age it goes off on a tangent and merits at least death; and rises in another age with lustre undimmed. It allows itself to be swallowed up in philosophy or theology or *belles lettres* or philology or politics or economics or law; and then it comes fully back into its own. It cannot possibly be kept down or reduced to a hopeless absurdity, for it comes closest of all disciplines to the daily lives of every student, scholar, teacher, investigator, and administrator.

The problem is to keep the subject vital and its teachers sane. One way is best; let those of common interests meet together and talk things over. As a profession we believe in talk, in its superior virtue as a solvent of misunderstsanding and ignorance, and we can wisely agree that the sanest men in any profession will be those who meet their colleagues in person and who reason with them together.

The Cincinnati Convention will be the best yet held by the Association if it is attended in large numbers by men and women anxious to coöperate, understand, and work for a common purpose.

ADD JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION—EDITORIAL—THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON AMERICAN SPEECH

[The following extract from a letter to the Editor from PROFESSOR GLENN N. MERRY is properly an editorial, and is here presented as such:]

THE JOURNAL can well afford to give the Joint Committee on American Speech assistance that will help arouse the interest of our members. I cannot conceive of our Association having no authoritative representatives in the problem of special sounds, provincialisms, and oral usage. The Modern Language Association is far ahead of us. Their section on Phonetics is very valuable, scholarly, and much within our field.

The *English Journal* and the General Federation of Women's Clubs have a vision for the Speech Committee work, and have published various announcements that have been widely distributed.

Mr. W. Wilbur Hatfield, Editor of the *English Journal,* is willing to finance a bulletin for English teachers who have had some training in Speech education. We cannot discriminate against this training, inasmuch as points of view in our department over the country are so varying. This bulletin would be the outgrowth of contributions by our own and the English Association's members. Professor Winans has agreed to write some communication, Mr. C. C. Certain of Detroit will write on the auditorium method, Mr. Hatfield on methods, I on voice, and I had hoped that some one would write on some phase of action in Speech. This would be a genuine effort to stabilize speech training in the high school where as yet there is no point of view. Mr. Hatfield is ready to support a resolution in the English Council next month, which I expect to

attend, to the effect that every teacher of English be required to take some training in Speech. This would be a great source of strength for our work. Such a bulletin, prepared by authorities in our own field and financed by the National Council of Teatchers of English, would be the right approach, to my mind, to the high school. For many years to come the general teacher of English in the smaller high school will be the only source of influence in Speech.

True, such a bulletin will be only a beginning. This should be followed by a careful study of what the curriculum in the high school should be; and our Assoeiation should be active in such a study, if not the leader.

Have you made your reservations at Cincinnati? Last year's meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science drew, according to report, over three thousand visitors. Cincinnati will be a cold place Christmas time for one not fortified with hotel reservations. See the Forum section for announcement of hotel rates. The dates are December 27, 28, and 29.

THE FORUM

TEACHING OF ORAL ENGLISH IN THE ELY HIGH SCHOOL

VARIOUS plans have been used in the teaching of oral English in schools. In some places it is done by the English teacher as a part of the regular English work. This has proved unsatisfactory because the English teacher is not trained to teach this work.

In other places, where a speech teacher is employed, she goes into the English class room on the average of about once a week and teaches the oral English work.

The main weakness here lies in the fact that the length of time between each lesson is so great that the student fails to grasp the significance of the work. With four days before him in which to prepare the assignment, the student does the very human thing

of leaving it for the last day; then remembers only vaguely what the assignment was, with the result that he gives at the best a very sketchy preparation. Neither content nor appreciation of a subject can be successfully taught where the teacher meets a situation in which she must recreate an interest in the work each time the class is met.

I should like to advance for your consideration another plan; that of having the student turn his entire attention over to speech work for a period of from four to six weeks.

Our plans as we have worked them out and tried them for two years have produced far from perfect results, but we feel that these results have been more satisfactory than under the other system. We feel that concentrated attention for a period of four weeks each year during the high school course makes it more possible to impress the fact that speech training should function not alone in the English class room, but in every class room in school; as also the iron shop, the gymnasium, the street, the home.

Moreover, this system makes it possible to teach a connected group of facts, the content of the subject itself, and thus correct the idea that speech training is merely a by-product of something else.

In the freshman year emphasis is placed upon speech construction. An outline is required for each speech, following this simple form: I. Introduction, II. Discussion, III. Conclusion. Complete statements have been required in outlining in order to encourage clear, clean-cut thinking. Only one central idea is developed in each speech.

One of our greatest problems of this year has been to make the student feel comfortable while on the floor. Sales talks in which the student sells any article, from a pin to an automobile; applications for a position, where one student acts as an employer and the other the man wishing a position; pantomimes of some daily occupation, or a Mother Goose rhyme have all been helpful in creating a situation where students can freely express themselves. I have used the suggestions which Alma M. Bullowa gave in her article on "Courses in Oral English" in THE QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH EDUCATION for November, 1922, and have found them very helpful.

Simple breathing and voice exercises are given in this freshman year and throughout the course. A minimum of fifteen minutes a day for practice on these exercises, is required.

In the sophomore year the need of constructing a speech well is again emphasized. Various plans are used to have the student construct speeches which contain unity, emphasis, and coherence. An assignment is made requiring an outline like this: I. We should be courteous in the classroom, because—a. The situation demands it. b. A good habit is formed. c. . . . . d. . . . . We do some work in declamation in this year using such selections as "Opportunity," by Edmund Rowland Sill, "A Message to Garcia," "Cassius Against Caesar," "The Revenge," "If," "The Home of the Republic," "I am an American."

In the third year we try to make a definite improvement in speech material as well as construction. Model speeches are studied in order that the student may understand and appreciate the elements of an effective speech. The need for strong introductions and conclusions is presented. Logical thinking is emphasized in the study of argumentation. Simple debates are held, in which it is expected that no statement shall be made that cannot be supported. A very short time is spent upon the rudiments of parliamentary practice.

In the senior year the student is expected to make a speech which moves, a speech which carries over to his audience. As each senior is eligible to try out for the senior class play, we have adopted a short course in dramatic art for seniors. After-dinner speaking is also presented during this last month of speech training.

We rest our recommendation for this plan upon the hope that when the student has finished the four months of work, he has more successfully mastered the fundamentals of oral English and gained an appreciation of its function in life. One student who had taken the work for two years under the plan of having it once a week and then took it for two years under the other plan, said, "We lost the holiday we had once a week, but we gained real knowledge of a worth-while subject."

JOSEPHINE TIEGAN, *Ely, Minnesota.*

SPEECH TRAINING BY THE UNIVERSAL ALPHABET

A GENERATION ago a universal alphabet was formulated by a few students of phonetics and teachers of foreign languages, chiefly in countries of Europe. Imperfect as it was then and still is, this alphabet has proved of much value in overcoming some of the chief difficulties in learning a language other than the student's

mother tongue. The International Phonetic Association was organized and has gone on with its efforts to simplify language teaching by the use of a standard alphabet containing all the sound-representations of the languages of Europe. With such facile instrument of phonetics, he who has mastered the alphabet for his own language, and has learned a few more sounds, with appropriate letters, from the languages other than his own, is equipped to read with correct pronunciation many other languages. Any language, though he has never heard it before, even English, he can read so that it may be understood by the native. In time perhaps this alphabet will be so fully developed that it will represent by its letters all sounds used in human speech by any "nation, race, or tribe on this terrestrial ball." The war stopped the publication of its magazine, *Le Maitre Phonetique,* but publication is again to be resumed at once.

Here is ready to hand a means of speech training of great value. Every alphabet has worth for the training of students in enunciation, in pronunciation, in fine discrimination of sounds. Teachers of elocution have long been accustomed to drill classes on tongue twisters, like "She sells sea shells. Shall she sell sea shells?" rattled off at breakneck speed. The German student is encouraged to develop facility in handling "acht hundert acht und achtig." The Swede will substitute his 777, and the Bohemian his equivalent of the word for river, or any other having *r* with point over the letter. But in the universal alphabet, once learned, its students find at once a full assortment of all sounds of the mother tongue and also many others. The American, for example, will find the gutturals, nasals, palatals, liquids of various other languages quite unfamiliar to him.

The organs of human speech are not widely different among the peoples of earth whether the most cultivated or most primitive. With a little training when young, almost every child, of whatever race or speech, could probably be taught the simple elementary sounds of all forms of uttered means of vocal communication. To know every human speech sound while young would be an invaluable acquisition to any child. If learned young, it would be a long step toward a much wider knowledge of languages than anything now known.

There was a time when affectation was the rule in many things in civilized life. Even in this age of deadly enmity to cant, the

affectation of superiority by reason of inability to enunciate the sounds used by peoples of different language has not wholly died out. We still have those who like to be recognized as different because they say sibboleth rather than shibboleth. We still make it a point of pride in most countries to insist upon mangling each proper name from abroad to make it suit our theories of the genius of our particular language. But these things are passing. A day of broader view is dawning. There are many marks to show that hereafter we mean to learn the right name of a man though it be Kon-fu-tse and train ourselves to pronounce it correctly, instead of insisting that the name shall have mayhem and other crimes committed upon it to make it into Confucius. In all this, the world alphabet or universal alphabet will be found useful. Quintilian urged exercises in making sounds in his teachings in Rome in oratory 1900 years ago. We have made no improvement in this since his day. The universal alphabet is at hand for such practical use. J. C. RUPPENTHAL, *University of Kansas.*

PROFESSOR B. C. Van Wye, Chairman of the Committee on Local Arrangements for the 1923 convention at Cincinnati, again calls attention to the fact that the Gibson Hotel is the official headquarters of the convention. He points out that there will be thousands at the same time in Cincinnati attending the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and warns that those wishing reservations would do well to make them early. For rates at the Gibson see the June number of the QUARTERLY. He sends word of other hotels and their rates at follows:

SINTON HOTEL:
Single rooms, with bath, $3.00 up
Double rooms, with bath, $5.00 up

GRAND HOTEL (Opposite Union Station):
Rooms, without bath, $1.50 to $2.00 each person
Rooms, with bath, single, $2.50 to $3.50
Double rooms, with bath, $4.00, $5.00 and $6.00

HAVLIN HOTEL (Automobile Club Headquarters):
Single room, with bath, $3.00 to $5.00
Double room, with bath, $5.00 to $8.00

METROPOLE (Same mangement as Havlin):
Single room, without bath, $1.75 to $2.25
Single room, with bath, $2.50 to $3.50
Double room, without bath, $3.50 to $4.00
Double room, with bath, $4.00, $5.00 and $6.00

There are a number of small hotels with corresponding rates. Any members wishing reservations made for them may address Professor B. C. Van Wye, care Cosmopolitan Tours Co., 115 Dixie Terminal Arcade, Cincinnati, and the specific reservations will be gladly made.

The chief attraction by way of amusement for Convention week is David Warfield in "The Merchant of Venice." Other attractions are not yet booked but will be at hand.

TENTATIVE CONVENTION PROGRAM

Each report limited to ten minutes;
Each paper or address to fifteen minutes.

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 27

10:00 A. M.

Address of Welcome—PRESIDENT HICKS, University of Cincinnati.
President's Address—HARRY B. GOUGH.
Address—"The Common Front"—DWIGHT L. WATKINS, University of California.
Report—"New England Conference"—I. L. WINTER, Harvard University.
"Oratory and Rhetoric in the Roman Imperial Period"—HARRY E. CAPLAN, Cornell University.
"The Psychological Problems of Oral Composition"—(Not yet assigned).
"The Rhetoric of Debate"—A. CRAIG BAIRD, Bates College.
Report—"The QUARTERLY JOURNAL"
1. The Editor—CHARLES H. WOOLBERT, University of Illinois.
2. The Business Manager—RAY K. IMMEL, University of Michigan.
Group Discussions.

2:30 P. M.

"A Psychological Approach to the Rhetoric of Speech Composition"—WILLIAM E. UTTERBACK, Dartmouth College.
"Development of the Speaking Voice"—GLENN N. MERRY, State University of Iowa.
"Rhetoric and Poetry"—HOYT H. HUDSON, Swarthmore College.
"Problems of Structure in Extempore Speaking"—(Not yet assigned).
"Oratorical Rhythm"—W. M. PARRISH, University of Pittsburgh.
"Experimental Studies in Vocal Expression"—ANDREW T. WEAVER, University of Wisconsin.
"The Training of the Public Speaker in Rome in the Time of Cicero"—RUSSELL WAGNER, State College of Iowa.
"Fostering Oral English"—ALBERT M. HARRIS, Vanderbilt University.
"A Workable Bibliography for the Beginner in Speech Correction Work"—(Not yet assigned).
Group Discussions.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 28

10:00 A. M.

Reports—The Committee on Teaching of Public Speaking in Technical and Professional Schools—Presiding, EVERETT L. HUNT, Chairman, Cornell University.

"Some Phases of the Study of the Theatre"—EDWARD C. MABIE, State University of Iowa.

"The Educational Significance of Public Speaking Courses as Stimulating Expression"—WILLIAM HAWLEY DAVIS, Bowdoin College.

"Behavioristic Aspects of Speech Defects"—GILES W. GRAY, University of Illinois.

"Problems in the Teaching of Debate and Argumentation"—(Not yet assigned).

Report—Committee on College Entrance Credit—J. WALTER REEVES, Chairman, Peddie Institute.

Group Discussions.

2:30 P. M.

Reports—The Membership Committee—Presiding, WILBUR JONES KAY, Chairman, University of West Virginia.

"Problems in Speech Correction"—(Not yet assigned)

"Experimental Studies in Evoking Reactions to Content"—(Symposium) (Speakers not yet definitely assigned).

Reports—The Secondary School Committee—Presiding, ROBERT E. WILLIAMS, Chairman, DePauw University.

Group Discussions.

8:00 P. M.

"Dramatizing Our Common Life"—JAMES WATT RAINE, Berea College.

Dramatic Productions and Old English Ballads—MOUNTAIN PLAYERS, Berea College.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 29

10:00 A. M.

Reports—Research Committee—Presiding, H. A. WICHELNS, Chairman, University of Pittsburgh.

"The Growing Recognition of Amateur Dramatic Production"—(Not yet assigned).

Unfinished Business.

NEW BOOKS

RHETORIC AND ORATORY IN CLASSICAL HISTORIOGRAPHY

An Introduction to the History of History, by JAMES T. SHOTWELL. New York. Columbia University Press. 1922.

Thucydides, with an English translation, by C. FORSTER SMITH. Four volumes. Vol. I, 1919. Vol. II, 1920. Vol. III, 1921. New York. Putnam's. Loeb Classical Library.

Livy, with an English translation, by B. O. FOSTER. Thirteen volumes. Vol. I, 1919. Vol. II, 1922. New York. Putnam's. Loeb Classical Library.

Sallust, with an English translation by J. C. ROLFE. New York. Putnam's. 1921. Loeb Classical Library.

In the second book of Cicero's *De Oratore,* Antonius is made to ask, "What sort of orator, or how great a master of language, do you think it requires to write history?" Said Catullus, "If to write is as the Greeks have written, a man of the highest powers; if as our countrymen, there is no need of an orator; it is sufficient for the writer to tell truth." Antonius continues, "It is far from wonderful that history has not yet made a figure in our language; for none of our countrymen study eloquence except to display it in pleading and in the forum; whereas among the Greeks, the most eloquent men, wholly unconnected with public pleading, sought to gain renown in other ways, such as writing history."

A modern historian, attempting to impose the rigor of scientific method upon history, finds much to reprehend in the idea that history is an orator's work, employing rhetorical methods. The Roman view that history is written first of all to hold the interest and attention of the readers, a large part of whom are seeking the diversion which a modern reader finds in the novel, that it is part of the literary art, demanding great care in composition and stylistic effect, and that it fulfills its more serious function in serving as an

aid to orators and statesmen, providing examples for emulation or avoidance, is a view that is cited only to show what progress we have made in our conception of history. The student of rhetoric may admit freely that the classical historians were literary artists primarily, and that their rhetoric injures their historical accuracy; but this will only increase the significance of their work for him. If he is interested in history as material for the speech maker, he will agree with Quintilian that "history may provide the orator with a nutriment which we may compare to some rich and pleasant juice."

Many of the speeches written by the historians are also models of composition. But the student who would understand the "Funeral Oration" of Pericles should know the other speeches of Thucydides; he should have a background that would enable him to know how much is Pericles and how much Thucydides. Once embarked upon a study of the speeches of Thucydides he is likely to investigate the rhetorical elements of all the classical historians. He will be interested in the effect of the fact that much of ancient history was composed not to be read, but to be heard. As Macaulay says in his essay on History, "It was not to the slow circulation of a few copies, which the rich only could possess, that the aspiring author looked for his reward. The great Olympian festival was to witness his triumph. The interest of the narrative, and the beauty of the style, were aided by the imposing effect of recitation—by the splendor of the spectacle,—by the powerful influence of sympathy. A critic who could have asked for authorities in the midst of such a scene, must have been of a cold and skeptical nature; and few such critics there were. As was the historian, such were the auditors—inquisitive, credulous, easily moved by religious awe or patriotic enthusiasm."

Herodotus writes largely in direct discourse. In his history, as in the Iliad and Odyssey, the author seldom speaks when there is a pretext for making his characters speak. Only rarely, however, does he rise from the colloquial key into the set speech of rhetorical argumentation. Such speeches were first made a part of history by Thucydides. He himself gives us this word about their authenticity: "As to the various speeches . . . I have found it difficult to retain a memory of the precise words which I had heard spoken; and so it was with those who brought me reports. But I have made the persons say what it seemed opportune for them to say in view

of each situation; at the same time, I have adhered as closely as possible to the general sense of what was actually said." It is in his speeches that Thucydides has introduced most of his political reasoning and has related his events in the sequence of cause and effect. The classical historians, of course, largely ignored causes which are now held to be of prime importance. They probably overestimated the historical significance of speeches.

But this again only serves to show what a powerful factor public speaking was held to be. As Bury observes in his *Ancient Greek Historians*, "We may regret this corruption, as we call it, of history. But it is more to the purpose to understand the Greek point of view. It is not easy for us to realize the importance which the art of rhetoric possessed for the Greeks as a purveyor of aesthetic pleasure. Indeed the history of Greek rhetoric testifies, perhaps as impressively as the history of Greek plastic, to the large part which aesthetic pleasure played in Greek life. People went to hear a rhetorical display just as we go to hear a symphony. Just as the historians, or we should say mythologers, of the Homeric age were epic poets, so the later historians were rhetoricians. If the historian were not trained in the school of the rhetorician he would have had few readers." The truth of Bury's observation is illustrated by Polybius. He of all the classical historians approached most nearly the scientific ideal. Yet because he never learned to tell a story effectively it is only with the growth of the scientific method that he is being rescued from comparative obscurity.

The love of rhetoric extended late into the Graeco-Roman period and influenced Roman historians even more than the Greek. In fact, as Shotwell points out, it was largely the rhetorical influence of Greece that gave rise to the saying, "Greece captive, captured Rome." Philosophy, the Romans thought, was best to be studied by travel, especially by going to Athens. It was the grammarians and rhetoricians who taught the Latins the arts of elegance and sophistication. The Roman historians, even when there were available authentic copies of the speeches introduced into their accounts, rewrote them that they might conform to the tone of the composition as a whole. Primarily they were artists.

Sallust attempted to apply to his work the standards of Thucydides and Polybius and to abandon the current rhetorical methods; but he continued the custom of inserting speeches which were largely his own composition. In antiquity all the orations in his

works were greatly admired, and collections of them were made for use in schools of rhetoric. Livy as a young man was a professed teacher of rhetoric. Quintilian in asserting that the Roman historians equal the Greek, puts Livy on the same level as Herodotus, and says that he "has a wonderful charm and transparency in narrative, while his speeches are eloquent beyond description; so admirably adapted is all that is said both to the circumstance and to the speaker; and as regards the emotions, especially the more pleasing of them, I may sum him up by saying that no historian has ever depicted them to greater perfection." In the thirty-five books which have come down to us there are over four hundred speeches. From these also were made collections for rhetorical use. Tacitus was an orator of note in his younger days. His continuing interest is expressed in his *Dialogus de Oratoribus,* which is an attempt to explain the decline in Roman Oratory. (Translated for the Loeb Classical Library by W. Peterson in 1914.)

Gaston Boissier, Professor of Latin Eloquence at the Collège de France, has perhaps given the best account of the rhetorical elements in Tacitus. "Tacitus speaks lightly enough of the rhetors in the *Dialogue,* yet, for all that, he had attended their schools, and, more than he would have wished, retained their stamp. There the pupil was given a cause to defend, very often a detestable cause, sometimes the *pro* and *con* to maintain. When he had received or selected a subject, of whatever nature it might be, he no longer thought of aught save putting it in its best light. . . . I am tempted to believe that these singular reasonings, surprising in so sound an intellect, and that, generally speaking, all the pleasure he feels in making two adversaries debate, and debate so well that he forgets self and puts himself in their place, imagines arguments for them more showy than solid, are all a reminiscence of the time when at school he pleaded the *pro* and *con* to the applause of his masters and schoolmates. It is thus that at moments, in this dignified senator, this ex-consul nearing his fiftieth year, this severe historian, the pupil of the rhetors comes to life anew."

Tacitus, however, as Thucydides, never introduces a speech merely for rhetorical effect, but always uses it to illustrate a political situation or a character. The importance generally attached to a speech, even in hurried times of battle, is evident from an account Tacitus gives of the confusion in the army of an enemy surprised by a foe. "He who was in command could neither harangue it nor

draw it up in order of battle." Apparently the two operations are held to be equally necessary.

The ancient practice of introducing speeches into history came in again at the revival of literature. Macchiavelli, Guicciardini, and Mézerai embellished their narratives with them. Jebb thought it an extraordinary example of the rhetorical taste of the age that Mézerai could make Joan of Arc address her executioners in a harangue full of violent invective when there existed the contemporary record of her trial with its notice of the few and broken utterances which belonged to her last hours. "He preferred to declaim, when he might have told a true story of the deepest pathos," says Jebb. Gradually the practice of inventing speeches for historical accounts became the subject of literary controversy, and Voltaire helped to end it when he declared in 1761 that the set speeches of the historians "are a sort of oratorical lie."

Shotwell, in his *Introduction to the History of History*, presents the various elements in historiography which have made it unscientific; the myth and legends, the religious elements of Jewish and Christian history, and the rhetorical tendencies of the Greek and Roman historians. In addition to his chapters on individual historians, in which he notes their use of rhetoric, two chapters especially are of interest to the student of rhetoric and oratory. In the section on Greek History there is a chapter entitled, "Rhetoric and Scholarship;" and in Roman History he devotes a chapter to "Oratory and Poetry." The biblographies appended make the book an especially valuable guide. As a historian of the scientific school, Professor Shotwell believes that "history differs from the rest of literature in that it is more science than art, a social rather than an individual product." It is to be expected, then, that Professor Shotwell will have scant sympathy for the orations and other rhetorical effects of the ancient historians. "Formal rhetoric, however, did not limit itself to the speeches. Such obvious devices did perhaps less harm to historiography than the general tendency which they represented to sacrifice accuracy for effect. History, at best a poor enough mirror of reality, is readily warped by art; and rhetoric is art of the most formal kind. It distorts into ordered arrangement the haphazard, unformed materials which chance produces or preserves. It sets its pieces like an impresario and completes with convincing elegance."

Yet for all his scientific zeal, Professor Shotwell is not an unsympathetic critic. "Rhetoric is to us largely a subject for school children, and is branded in later life with the scorn of things immature: but the Greek ideal was not altogether vain. The great art of expression by words is surely as worthy one's study as arts which live in color or stone. At once plastic and monumental, preserving the form and color of reality by the choice of a clear-cut word or the finely moulded phrase, rhetoric elevates the prose of literature to replace the vanishing art of poetry. . . . It was therefore inevitable that speech-making should over-run the narrative of history, and the play upon language over-run speech-making; as inevitable as that the histories of the nineteenth century should be couched so largely in the terms of national politics, or those of the twentieth include the survey of economics and the sciences."

Professor Shotwell's book is a valuable guide to the student of rhetoric, and it will suggest a method for many profitable investigations. Along with it might be mentioned Boissier's study of Tacitus, and of the schools of declamation at Rome. Bury's *Ancient Greek Historians,* Jebb's study of the speeches of Thucydides, and Robinson's *New History* will have many suggestions. But with all the method in the world, and with endless books about books, we would still lack the essential material. This is being rapidly supplied by the Loeb Classical Library. Many students will prefer Jowett's translation of Thucydides to Smith's; but the presence of the Greek text on the opposite page is a convenience and a necessity for studies of sound, meter, and rhythm, to say nothing of controverted points of translation. With the original and the translation before one, it is agreeably surprising to find how quickly a vocabulary can be built up. With vivid recollections of his school days, Professor Shotwell says of Cæsar's *Commentaries,* "Few books, however great, can stand the test of use in schools and still retain a hold upon us in later life, and it was a questionable gain to Cæsar that he wrote in such simple, lucid phrase as to make his works the object of the desolating struggles of the young with Latin prose. But if one does, by any chance, go back to Cæsar after years of absence from the school room, one finds a surprise awaiting him."

The Loeb Classical Library will bring many delightful sur-

prises to one whose Latin and Greek has almost been relegated to the limbo of forgotten things. And for public speaking teachers it will transform a study that was never quite convincing when presented in the light of formal discipline, into a practical professional pursuit. Investigations in the rhetorical elements of classical historiography need not be postponed until a leave of absence is earned, or a university library is at hand, or a specialist is present to guide. The small college library, some work with the professors of Latin and Greek, a stiff resistance to deadening routine, a little of the diligence that we constantly recommend to our pupils, if combined with a modicum of intelligence, will produce studies of value to the individual and to the profession.

Scientific research may invalidate the historical accuracy of the classics. It is probably true, as Professor Shotwell observes, that "the historian's method of investigation often seems to weaken as his rhetoric improves." The scientific historian may be eternally distrustful of the literary. But a study of these rhetorical historians is a study of the highest art. In the words of our critic of rhetoric, "Here the product of the age of Pericles remains unsurpassed still; the works of Herodotus and Thucydides standing like the Parthenon itself,—models for all time."

E. L. HUNT, *Cornell University.*

Great Modern Sermons. Edited by H. D. MCKEEHAN. Fleming H. Revell, New York. 1923. Pp. 212.

Here are collected thirteen sermons by living Protestant preachers; five Britons, the others Americans. The editor has selected the leading preachers in accordance with general opinion so far as he could ascertain it; his selection will, for the greater part, not be seriously questioned. Such divines as Canon Barnes, Dean Inge, Doctors Cadman, Kelman, Hillis, Burrell, Gordon, Fosdick, Jefferson, will probably be accepted as representative men of the pulpit. The sermons included have for the greater part been chosen by their authors. The result is a considerable diversity of subjects: matters of church policy such as revivalism, matters of theology such as immortality and the nature of faith, simple ethical injunctions like Fosdick's sermon on procrastination for young people. With range in topic goes range in style. It is a far cry from the simplicity and concreteness of Fosdick, as represented in

this volume, to Cadman's literary and subtle treatment of faith; while in the remaining eleven sermons are found most of the intermediate levels of ease or difficulty.

One cannot read this volume without being struck by the difference between direct argument and rhetorical strategy as exercised in persuasion. The scheme—or skeleton—or outline—of many of these sermons seems far removed from that of the brief. Though we know a number of books on brief-making, we have yet to find a pamphlet on planning a speech with regard to the needs of rhetoric as well as to those of logic. From a judicious selection of speeches of all types we might, perhaps, deduce a catalogue of schemes such as we find hinted in various texts, yet never fully developed. Thus in "Preaching and Sermon Construction" (MacMillan, 1922) Paul B. Bull gives a few pages to various plans: one is logical (but for exposition rather than for argument), another historical, a third for "recommending a virtue." Other casual treatments of the subject of plan of discourse could be mentioned, but no complete account. The task of charting the forms in which a maker of speeches may cast his thought still awaits a modern rhetorician. Studies of sermons seemingly offer the necessary variety of material.

H. A. WICHELNS, *University of Pittsburgh.*

Cicero and His Influence. JOHN C. ROLFE. Marshall Jones, Boston. 1923. Pp. vii, 178.

This book is one of a series called "Our Debt to Greece and Rome." It is designed to reveal what influence Cicero as a public man and as a stylist had upon succeeding generations; his philosophical influence is reserved for a separate volume by another writer. The series, as its name indicates, is part of the current propaganda in favor of the classics. In this volume the note of special pleading is often heard; there is a defense of Cicero's character, which, though strictly irrelevant, occupies one-third of the text; moreover, there is a general tone of enthusiasm—an exaggeration of phrase of the sort often called "oratorical." The limited scope of the book and the author's literary bent combine to produce a rapid summary, well-proportioned except for the major defect noticed above and for numerous irrelevant *obiter dicta* on current topics. Thus we are offered a slur upon the Fordney tariff, an opinion upon

the usefulness of Latin as an international language, and an occasional gem of opinion such as: "Whenever government officials have been actuated by a high sense of responsibility and a genuine spirit of patriotism, they have consciously or unconsciously followed in the footsteps of Cicero." (P. 27.) The tracing of an influence calls for greater subtlety than is contained in this passage.

The faults of the advocate, however, are most noticeable in the first third of the work. When the author at last begins to trace the great Roman's position as an orator—first in his own day and so down to modern times—he provides an excellent popular summary. The twenty pages devoted to Cicero as an orator advance no novel views, they enter upon no minutiae of scholarship, but they serve as an introduction to the question of Cicero's contributions to the development of rhetorical theory and practice in his own day. In later chapters the popularity of Cicero's various writings as models of style is traced with a concision that may make for disproportion in detail yet provides a fairly balanced view of the whole. The first impression of the book is that it is journalistic and superficial; the last, that its substance is better than its style.

H. A. WICHELNS, *University of Pittsburgh.*

Abraham Lincoln as a Man of Letters. L. E. ROBINSON. Putnam, New York. 1923. Pp. 340.

This is an interesting book, more valuable now than on its first appearance five years ago, by virtue of an appendix of Lincoln's writings which occupies one-third of the whole. It is also a disappointing book, by virtue of its method, which is narrative rather than critical. An account is given us of Lincoln's speeches and state papers, and of the historical situations which produced them, together with such comments on style and such applications to the present political situation as the author deems fit. The result is Lincoln's biography rewritten from the standpoint of his public utterances and with a view to inculcating certain lessons of democracy. But the result is not what the title implies. A single chapter of accurate summary and evaluation would have done much to increase our understanding of Lincoln as a man of letters. Another chapter on the growth of Lincoln's literary powers would seem to be called for. We have no right, perhaps, to expect in this work a distinct treatment of Lincoln as orator, for the modern

trend in criticism is to disregard the *kinds* of literary art and to pass quickly from the subject's thought to the details of his style: from the guiding principles of his mental life to his rhythms and choice of words. Thus the important differences caused by the type of artistic production are neglected. A chapter or two on Lincoln's style as a speaker, as a letter-writer, as an author of state papers, would help us to a finer discrimination than Professor Robinson offers us. The proper estimate of style requires us to do more than to weigh the soundness of the writer's thought and to notice the beauties of his expression. No great writer delivers his ideas to the world at large; he delivers them to his own limited world. Whatever his medium, the writer or speaker has an audience with certain ideas on the matter in hand and with an ascertainable literary background. Professor Robinson's failure to measure Lincoln's adaptation to his audience and to picture the literary background of Illinois and of America in the quarter-century before the civil war leaves another void in the account of Lincoln as a man of letters.

These criticisms may be counsels of perfection, impossible of achievement in the present state of criticism. The criticism of oratory in particular always presents difficulties. First, we have to allow for the fact that from the printed page we judge a discourse intended for the ear. Second, and more important, the orators have fared badly at the hands of critics and historians of literature; when discussed at all, oratory tends to be treated as if it were the art of the political essayist or pamphleteer. With this it has an undoubted connection, but with this it is by no means identical. As a result of neglect or confusion in the past, we lack both models and canons of criticism in dealing with oratory. It would be an interesting and highly valuable piece of work to examine such criticisms of oratory as there is and to deduce the canons applied—consciously or unconsciously—by those who have ventured into this field of criticism. Such editors as Goodrich, the biographers of the orators, and the standard historians of literature, together with the rhetoricians (whose works, however, should form but a small part of the whole) should be examined, and their methods synthetized into a mode of procedure for criticizing orators as men of letters. Such a study seems a necessary preliminary to proper critical work in the field of oratory.

H. A. WICHELNS, *University of Pittsburgh.*

Informal Oral Discussion. By GEORGE PICKETT WILSON. New York. The Palmer Company.

For this book the author claims newness. But the uniqueness appears to consist in the differentiation between a spoken communication delivered while seated and that delivered while standing before, say, a class of fellow-students. The probably worthy contention is advanced that conversation is interrupted and lacks unity; that on the other hand "an oral composition is the uninterrupted, informal communication of thought by means of oral speech."

Now while objection would be made to the insistence upon the "informal" element, it is probable that generally the definition and the treatment afforded in this little book of 188 pages would be accepted. It is my opinion that the book is finely suggestive for teachers of English Composition as to the necessity for more attention to oral composition; but it contains no newness for the teacher of public speaking or speech.

It appears that the principal object of the work is to cover a field between conversation and formal public speaking; and with that end in view the author appears to have in mind always the student *sitting* in the class room talking to his mates. But just why the informal and the "at ease" kind of spoken composition should be so stressed to the practical exclusion of the equally important more formal speech delivered while standing before an audience, small or great, is not made clear. Perhaps Mr. Wilson would not write as he does to students beyond the freshman year.

The chapter headed "General Suggestions" deserves emphasis on the *General*: e. g., he states that a talk must be made interesting and he advises (page 28): "when you begin your talk, put life into it; pretend that you are interested, immensely so, and within a short time the pretended will become surprisingly real." He further advises clear thinking, clear transitions, vocal variety, clean-cut enunciation, and so on. All these suggestions are good; but some of us have spent long years at this business and believe that such matters whether the speaker is sitting or standing, cannot be inculcated through the medium of a few exceedingly general hints covered in a page or two of a text.

Informal oral composition the author divides into three "forms": "The first form consists in telling in your own words

what someone else has said or written;" the second, "is telling what you yourself have thought out and shaped into some logical order;" the third, "is talking on a topic impromptu, without knowing beforehand either your subject or the language you are to use." Considerable space is given to each of these "forms;" e. g., eighty-five pages are consumed in treating of the first "form;" but approximately fifty-five of these eighty-five pages carry quoted articles. So far as the third form is concerned, many teachers of speech or public speaking agree that it has little place, if any, in the class room, especially for beginners. "Impromptu" speaking is rather dangerous business, even for the most experienced.

The book is readable and, in many regards, most timely; but it is inadequate, especially as to the presentation phases of oral composition work. It is suggestive to the teacher of English Composition as already stated in that it points out the disproportionate time and energy spent on written work, and the absolute necessity for greater emphasis upon the spoken communication; but in the attempt to stress "informal" elements, some of the larger aspects of the complex problems of extempore speaking are entirely omitted.

In any event, the book is an evidence of the insistent demand for larger recognition of the fact so aptly put by Prof. Palmer from whose work Mr. Wilson quotes, "We speak a hundred times for every one we write."

H. B. GOUGH.

FIVE-CENT SPEECHES

100 Master Speeches, by WILLIAM HOMER AMES, Ph. B., and PAUL A. MILLER, B. D. Published by the Evangelical Press for the Public Speakers' Society, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. 1922. $5.

This book is full of surprises and of disappointments. One is startled, for example, to learn from the title-page that this practically unknown volume is "a Treasury of the World's Best Thought on Questions of To-day." Disappointment is in store, when one turns to the one hundred master speeches and discovers that the world's best thought is so thin and watery, so evasive and platitudinous. Here, for example, is a speech which develops in a thousand words the profundity that "A College Education is a Greater Asset Than a 50-Acre Farm." And it is

disappointing that the world's best thought cannot get itself expressed a little more skilfully. In the "Address of County Superintendent" with which the collection begins, we read:

> If Vanderbilt did not value education, why does Vanderbilt University exist? If Girard sneered at learning, why do we have a Girard College? If John *(sic)* Hopkins derided letters, why does that University now work among us?

Again, one is pleasantly surprised to find in Mr. Ames' preface the following:

> The lawyer has his books of forms to guide him in the preparation of legal documents, the physician has his compendium of typical prescriptions, but the public speaker searches his book-shelves in vain for the treasury of printed thought that would give him a point of departure for his own literary or oratorical effort.

On the whole, this sounds hopeful. That the speaker should have as a part of his equipment certain useful ideas or trains of thought, digested into commonplaces and ready to be drawn upon at need, has long been recognized in rhetorical theory. The speaker needs contact with current ideas, needs to read stimulating discussions "as a point of departure," just as Mr. Ames says. But turning to the hundred master speeches, one decides that Mr. Ames is not a wholly ingenuous person. The speeches in this volume, with one or two exceptions, plainly are not intended as points of departure for the prospective speaker: no, what Mr. Ames and his associate attempt is to write speeches which can be used almost *verbatim;* in other words, at five cents apiece, you can get speeches which require nothing on your part but memorization.

One is past being surprised, then, at "Our Message," with which the book closes. How different from Mr. Ames' innocent suggestion are such sentences as these:

> . . . All our speeches are printed on a good grade of plain white paper . . . and are in separate form so that one or two speeches can be carried in the pocket for study or used before an audience. . . . They are written without local character or personal or sectarian bias and can be delivered anywhere without offense to anyone in the audience.

Indeed! The present reviewer fears that many who might be in the audience before which a speaker was passing off one of Mr. Ames' petty speeches, would take considerable offense.

100 Master Speeches was reviewed a half-century ago by Ralph Waldo Emerson, when he wrote:

> We see it advertised that Mr. Grand will deliver an oration on the Fourth of July, and Mr. Hand before the Mechanics' Association, and we

do not go thither, because we know these gentlemen will not communicate their own character and being to the audience. If we had reason to expect such a communication, we should go through all inconvenience and opposition. The sick would be carried in litters. But a public oration is an escapade, a non-committal, an apology, a gag, and not a communication, not a speech, not a man.

Mr. Ames and his associates of the Public Speakers' Society appear to be doing all in their power to increase the number of speeches which are escapades, non-committals, apologies, and gags.

HOYT H. HUDSON, *Swarthmore College.*

Joining in Public Discussion. By ALFRED DWIGHT SHEFFIELD. New York. Doran. 1922.

This is the first volume to be added to The Worker's Bookshelf, and is intended to give "a self-starter towards influential speaking . . . to the thousands of men and women who are sitting silent in labor meetings, and who, with a little training, would find their voices and their true roles as contributors to labor's counsels."

The book is a small, paper-bound volume, of but one hundred sixty-five pages, and yet it aims in this space to cover the subjects of voice-training, posture, preparing a speech, delivering a speech, evidence, testimony, kinds of argument, reasoning, syllogisms, choice of words, committee organization and functioning, parliamentary procedure and debate—no small task for a book of this size.

The chief difficulty lies in the author's treatment of his subject. In his effort to build a psychological foundation for his treatise, he has produced a work which would be hard for a college graduate to follow,—yet it is intended for industrial workers. It is filled with such terms as "'defense-reactions," "character-patterns," "response-impelling ideas," "composite wave-impact of ideas," "action-tendencies of our ideas," "idea-factors," "response-implications," "inhibiting suspicions," "wishful day-dreams," "acts of inference," "relativity of facts," etc.,—and the worker is supposed to be so familiar with such expressions that they need no explanation!

Imagine the average trade-union worker struggling with sentences like these, picked at random from the book: "It (progress) suggests the antiquating of a mastery, the idea of which has become a sentiment, a vested claim of his self-esteem;" or "Roused

action-impulses need something slogan-like to keep them vibrating;" or this,—"It makes all the difference to the persuasive value of your words whether they call up action-tendencies in the hearer's mind that enhance or that inhibit its response to your plea. One might almost say that persuasion takes place through a sort of psychological syllogism, of which the major premise reminds the hearer of one of his active desires and the minor premise puts the speaker's contention as something that chimes in with it."

One is inclined to inquire why the author felt it necessary to include detailed explanations of syllogisms in such a restricted work, or why committee procedure should be deserving of an entire chapter. One might also be tempted to suggest that a more concrete, more practical, less figurative treatment, with more illustrations, might not be a wiser contribution to a "Worker's Bookshelf."

ELIZABETH AVERY, *Smith College.*

NEWS AND NOTES

NEWS FROM COLLEGE DEPARTMENTS

THE University Theatre, of the University of Iowa Department of Speech, presented the following program of plays during the eleven weeks summer session of 1923, and has announced its program for the present college year. The programs include the following plays:

Summer Session 1923

June 29—"Wappin' Wharf" by Charles S. Brooks.
July 6—"The Amazons" by Arthur Wing Pinero.
July 13—"Only 38" by A. E. Thomas.
July 19—"Much Ado About Nothing" by William Shakespeare.
August 11—"Daddy Long-Legs" by Jean Webster.
August 21—"His Majesty Bunker Bean" by Lee Wilson Dodd.

College Year 1923-1924

October 24-25—"The Torch Bearers" by George Kelley.
November 7-8—"He Who Gets Slapped" by Leonid Andreyev.
November 22-23—"To The Ladies!" by George S. Kaufman and Marc Connelly.
December 12-13—"The School for Scandal" by Richard Brinsley Sheridan.
January 16-17—"Kindling" by Charles Kenyon.
February 20-21—"Twelfth Night" by William Shakespeare.
March 26-27—"Loyalties" by John Galsworthy.
April 9-10—"Captain Applejack" by Walter Hackett.

The programs are presented under the direction of Professor E. C. Mabie, Mr. Vance Morton, and Mr. Gregory Foley.

Among the first American universities to recognize the science of phonetics is the State University of Iowa, which has recently appointed Miss Sarah T. Barrows to a position in phonetics in the Department of Speech. Miss Barrows has studied with many of the foremost phoneticians of Europe, both in theoretical and instrumental phonetics. She is especially interested in comparative phonetics and has studied the sound systems of many different languages. Courses will be given in comparative phonetics, English and German phonetics; and opportunity will be offered for research work in some of the phonetic problems: interpretation of intonation curves, transliteration of dialects, application of phonetics to the teaching of reading. A clinic will be arranged for the improvement of speech difficulties; there special attention will be given to the elimination of foreign accent in foreigner's English, and the acquisition of foreign accent in the case of the American learning a foreign language.

The University of Illinois has combined all its dramatic activities under one head by organizing what is called the Illini Dramatic Guild. The Guild has under its charge all the plays of the student dramatic organization, Mask and Bauble, the operetta given annually by the Women's Welfare League, and the men's opera given by the Pierrot Society. In addition it includes the Faculty Players' Club and their productions. With this new organization has been inaugurated a dramatic directorship for campus productions. The director appointed for this work is Mr. William C. Troutman of the staff in Public Speaking. Mr. Troutman will continue to teach the courses in dramatization and play

production while he is carrying on his work as dramatic director.

A new course in "The Correction of Speech Defects" has been instituted at the University of Illinois in charge of Mr. Giles Wilkerson Gray. The course is three hours for one semester. Also a new course for graduates only has been instituted, under the title "The Place of Speech in Human Behavior," under the direction of Professor C. H. Woolbert.

Public Speaking and Debating courses at Colby College this year have an unusually large enrollment. A total of 250 students out of the total enrollment of 505 have elected courses in Public Speaking. Twenty-five of the young women of the college have elected the course in debating.

All of the 310 Freshmen entering Mt. Holyoke College this fall were given the recently published Blanton-Stinchfield Speech Measurement Tests. Students majoring in psychology assisted in giving the tests, receiving credit for their work in Experimental Psychology. The work was done under the direction of Miss Sara Stinchfield, who received her doctor's degree in Speech from the University of Wisconsin a year ago. Miss Couch passed upon interpretative ability, dramatic instinct, and creative ability.

The work of Oratory and Public Speaking at Tufts College receives $200,000 from the will of the late Austin B. Fletcher of New York. Professor Newell C. Maynard has charged of Public Speaking at Tufts.

During the past summer, two Pennsylvania colleges offered courses in Speech Correction. Penn State College offered courses for teachers, speech supervisors, upperclass students, giving also speech clinic work for demonstration purposes and training of students and teachers. Miss Sara Stinchfield, of Mt. Holyoke College, was in charge of this work, and Miss Gertrude Kling, of the Mt. Airy School for the Deaf, in Philadelphia, was her assistant.

At Temple University courses in Speech Correction and Speech Clinic work were offered under the direction of Mrs. Davis, of the Corrective Speech Department of the Philadelphia schools.

PERSONALS

Mr. E. V. Andrews, Cornell A. B., formerly instructor in Public Speaking in the Albion, New York, High School, has accepted a similar position in the North High School of Rochester, New York.

Miss M. L. Colcord, Mt. Holyoke A. B., formerly instructor in Public Speaking in Western Reserve Academy, is Assistant Professor of Public Speaking in Iowa State College.

Miss M. M. Case, Cornell M. A., is instructor in Public Speaking in one of the Pittsburgh High Schools.

Mr. Wilbur Gilman, Cornell A. B., is instructor in English and Public Speaking in the University of Missouri.

Mr. Howard Bradley, Ohio Wesleyan A. B., formerly instructor at Iowa State College, is instructor in Public Speaking in Dartmouth College.

Mr. Hoyt Hudson, Cornell Ph. D., has been granted leave of absence from the Cornell Department of Public Speaking to act as assistant professor of English and Public Speaking in Swarthmore College.

Miss Ruth Kentzler, Wisconsin A. B., is instructor in Speech at Carleton College.

Miss Isabel Murray, Cornell A. B., is instructor in Public Speaking and Dramatics in the Ithaca High School.

Mr. William Olsen, Cornell A. B., is instructor in Public Speaking in the University of North Carolina.

Mr. W. M. Parrish, Cornell M. A., who was Acting Assistant Professor at Dartmouth during the absence of Professor Winans, is Assistant Professor of Public Speaking in the University of Pittsburgh.

Mr. Ralph Smith, Cornell A. B., is Instructor in English and Public Speaking in the University of Pittsburgh.

Miss Margaret Sherman, Wisconsin A. M., who was formerly instructor in Public Speaking at the Bloomsburg State Normal, Pennsylvania, is acting as instructor in Public Speaking at Lawrence College, Appleton, Wisconsin, this year.

Mr. F. D. Wallace, Cornell A. B., is instructor in Public Speaking in the University of Maine.

Mr. Russell Wagner, Cornell M. A., has resigned his position at Davidson College, Davidson, North Carolina, to become Assistant Professor of Public Speaking in Iowa State College.

Mr. Herbert A. Wichelns, Cornell Ph. D., has resigned his position at New York University to become Assistant Professor of Public Speaking in the University of Pittsburgh.

DIRECTORY

ALABAMA

Birmingham—Vandiver, Mrs. Jerome A., 1224 South Twentieth Street.

ARIZONA

Tucson — Cunningham, C. C., 701 North Second Avenue.
Lane, F. H.

ARKANSAS

Augusta—Dale, Edith N.
Crossett—Townsend, Gertrude.

CALIFORNIA

Alhambra—Kempler, Helen, Alhambra High School.
Berkeley—Bradway, Eva, 2400 Bancroft Way.
Flaherty, Martin C., Wheeler Hall, University of California.
McLean, Fannie W., 1829 Bancroft Way.
Patton, Elizabeth, 1111 The Alameda.
Perstein, Arnold, 462 Wheeler Hall, University of California.
Pichel, Irving, Playhouse.
Watkins, Dwight, Wheeler Hall, University of California.
Whitehead, George, Wheeler Hall, University of California.
Cloverdale—Pierson, Hanna.
Crescent City — Grinnell, Laura Thomas.
Inglewood—Crandall, Marian F., 5648 Lennox Avenue.
Kingsburg—Jillson, Bessie, Union High School.
Lockeford—McLaughlin, May.
Long Beach—Nattkemper, L. G., 414 East Seventh Street.
Los Angeles—Baylis, Edythe, 931 Fifth Avenue.
Gear, Mrs. Carella C., 5832 South Flower Street.
Lindsley, Charles F., Occidental College.
Marsh, Charles A., 4534 Russell Avenue.
Stivers, Charles G., M. D., 1115 Arapahoe Street.
Sturgis, Granville, 8224 De Longpie Avenue.
Mill Valley—Smith, Pearl, Mount Tamalpais Union High School.
Modesto—Painter, Margaret, Modesta High School.
Oakland—Miller, Mrs. Fanny Ward, Fanny Ward Miller School of Expression, 1455 First Avenue.
Witt, Julia A., 631 Poirier Street.
Sacramento—Edgar, Mrs. Blanche O., 2200 J Street.
San Diego—Hammon, Wilbur A., High School.
Hastings, Andrew S., 3786 Tenth Street.
San Francisco—Berg, Beda, 132 Elsie Street.
Read, Matie H., 500 Liberty Street.
San Jose—Sanderson, Virginia, 195 Reed Street.
Stalker, Ella R., 686 South Eleventh Street.
Santa Monica—Morris, Olive C., High School.
Santa Rosa—Fields, Catherine, 740 Mendocino Avenue.
Sebastopol—Schmidt, Leonie E.
Stanford University—Bassett, Lee Emerson, Leland Stanford Junior University.
Turtlock—Critser, Lura.
Watsonville—Radcliff, Ruth, 103 East Third Street.

COLORADO

Boulder—Ramsdell, Edward T., University of Colorado.
Denver—Daly, Bernadetta M., 1367 Kalamath Street.
Kingsley, Mrs. Perle Shale, 2056 South York Street
Florence—Gillespie, Evangeline.
Greeley—Taylor, Mrs. Daisy, 2047 Eighth Street.
La Junta—Boswell, Fannie J., 910 San Juan Avenue.

CONNECTICUT

Middletown—Gunnison, Binney, 324 Washington Street.
Milford—Myers, May E., Lauralton Hall.
Windsor—Cherry, G. F., Loomis Institute.

DELAWARE

Wilmington—Sharp, Sallie, 303 West 21st Street.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Brookland—Mooney, E. Vincent, Holy Cross College.
Washington—Burrill, Mary, Dunbar High School.
Hedrick, Jennie, 3321 N Street.
Pierce, Mrs Bess Baker, 147 R Street, N. E.
Renshaw, Ann T., 2109 F Street N. W.

FLORIDA

DeLand—Stover, Irving C., 201 Minnesota Avenue.

GEORGIA

Gainesville—Secor, Lois Gregg, Brenau College.
Valdosta—Willis, Florence F., 901 North Patterson Street.

IDAHO

Pocatello—Bond, Alic Edna.

ILLINOIS

Aurora—Wilson, K., East High School.
Argyle—Andrew, Dorothy.
Berwyn—Shaw, Elton Raymond, 3412 Carol Avenue.
Cairo—Ellias, Edith R., 1313 Ohio Street.
Carbondale—Mitchell, Adella.
Chicago—Blood, Mary A., Columbia College of Expression.
Brown, Evelyn, 2032 Birchwood Avenue.
Carnes, Miss L., 726 Bittersweet Place.
Dwyer, Martha H., 604 East 50th Place.
Gleissner, Lillian, 5208 Harper Avenue.
Kenyon, Dr. Elmer L., 104 South Michigan Avenue.
Nelson, B. G., 5714 Dorchester Avenue.
McCracken, Florence L., 712 Pine Grove Avenue.
Decatur—Watts, Anna L., 464 West North Street.
Du Quoin—Bunting, Theresa V.
Elgin—Jocelyn, Helen, 558 Division Street.
Evanston—Dennis, Ralph B., School of Speech, Northwestern University.
Gaylord, Joseph S., School of Speech, Northwestern University.
Herring, Mrs. Bertha F., 1008 Huiman Street.
Johnston, May, School of Speech, Northwestern University.
Lardner, J. L., School of Speech, Northwestern University.
McConathy, Mrs. Osbourne, 2118 Orrington Avenue.
Meikle, Beulah, 2001 Orrington Avenue.
Sarett, Lew R., School of Speech, Northwestern University.
Shirley, Marguerite E., Chapin Hall.
Strickler, Donald W., Wrangler House.
Galesburg—Menser, Clarence L., Knox College.
Shaw, Warren C., Knox College.
Sheets, Roberta D., Lombard College.
Wenzelmann, 200 South Cedar Street.
Hamilton—Brant, Golda.
Illiapolis—Little, Mary.
Jacksonville—Kingsley, Anna M., 239 Wbster Avenue.
Jordon, J. N., 416 North River Boulevard.
Thompson, Mrs. Perry C., 1124 West College Avenue.
Kirkwood—Hendrickson, Esther.
Lake Forest—Brooks, George E., Lake Forest College.
Lisle—Shonka, A. F., St. Procopius College.
Mattoon—Turnbull, Ida C., 2409 Western Avenue.
Maywood—Kemp, Isabel M., Township High School.
Moline — Wead, Grace, 619 21st Street.
Naperville—Oliver, Guy E., North Western College.
Oak Park—Blount, Ralph E., 124 South Oak Park Avenue.
Peoria—Dunn, Abigail A., 205 Kinsey Street.

Rock Falls—Marfleet, Naomi F., 213 Third Avenue.
Rockford—Borchers, Gladys, Rockford College.
Rock Island—Pearce, Iva C., Augustana College.
Story City—Henderson, Grace.
Urbana—Gray, Giles W., University of Illinois.
Johnson, Florence, 1110 West Nevada Street.
Woolbert, Charles H., University of Illinois.
Waukegan—McNaughton, Mrs. Geneva P., Waukegan Township High School.
Winnetka—Phillips, Arthur E., 451 East Hill Road.

INDIANA

Collegeville—Rapp, Rev. I. J.
Crawfordsville—Brigance, W. N., Wabash College.
Evansville—Franklin, Mrs. G. Bruce, 111 South First Street.
Joslin, Rose B., 623 Second Street.
Greencastle—Gough, H. B., DePauw University.
Strain, Mary A.
Williams, Robert E., De Pauw University.
Yeager, Beulah, 643 East Seminary Street.
Hanover—Bryngelson, Bryng.
Indianapolis—Perkins, Lola I., Manual Training High School.
Tallcott, Rollo Anson, 33 North Irvington Avenue.
Michigan City—Jungnickel, Elizabeth, 372 Woodlawn Avenue.
Muncie—Pavey, Mary C., Indiana State Normal School.
Ramsey, Mrs. May L., 720 West North Street.
Richmond—Trueblood, E. F., Earlham College.
Rockport—Richards, Lucile.
Terre Haute—Ray, Winnifred M., 226 South 14th Street.

IOWA

Algona—Skinner, Kate.
Ames—Colcord, Marian L., Iowa State College.
Kahle, Loren F., Iowa State College.
Raines, Lester, Iowa State College.
Shattuck, Fredrica V., Iowa State College.
Throne, Mildred I., Iowa State College.
Wagner, Russell H., Iowa State College.
Wilson, Helen E., Iowa State College.
Wood, Helen B., Iowa State College.
Burlington—Martin, John Dunn, 133 South Central Avenue.
Cedar Rapids—Chapin, Florence, High School.
Davenport—Bird, Mary Louise., 1425 Grand Avenue.
Heeschen, Ottilie D., 1404 West Pleasant Street.
Ward, Lavilla A., 124 West 13th Street.
Des Moines—Hardin, Ivan Bloom, 3806 Cottage Grove Avenue.
Van Tuyle, Mrs. Helen M., Roosevelt High School.
Dubuque—O'Hagan, Father E. J., Columbia College.
Fayette—Collett, Margaret Jayne, Upper Iowa University.
Fort Dodge—Hartzler, Mrs. A. J., 1819 Seventh Avenue, North.
Grinnell—Ryan, J. P., Grinnell College.
Independence—Smith, Marion H.
Indianola—Dennis, W. C., Simpson College.
Iowa City—Bane, Lorene, 522 East College Street.
Brooks, Dorothy, 120 North Clinton Street.
Cook, Hazel F., 215 South Johnson Street.
Fitting, Ione L., 114 East Fairchild Street.
Freeburg, Mildred, 430 North Dubuque Street.
Langworthy, Helen, 430 North Dubuque Street.
Mabie, Edward, University of Iowa.
Merry, Glenn N., University of Iowa.
Morton, Vance M., University of Iowa.
Norvelle, R., University of Iowa.
Simon, Clarence T., Beta House.
Weller, Herbert C., University of Iowa.
Wilcox, Edna, Currier Hall.
Wood, Harry Thomas, University of Iowa.

Jefferson—Gailey, Marjorie, 608 South Cherry Street.
Lamoni—Roberts, Forest A., Graceland College.
Le Mars—Smith, Roy M., 501 Second Avenue, Southeast.
Monticello—Wyllie, Helen I.
Mount Pleasant—Morrison, Ira G., Iowa Wesleyan College.
Mount Vernon—Himstead, R. E., Cornell College.
Postville—Staadt, Edward.
Sioux City—Clark, Gladys M., 2001 South Newton Street.
Webster City—Hughes, Leila.
West Bend—McFarland, Irene.

KANSAS

Burrton—Storer, Blanche.
Garden City—Downing, Ethel A.
Hays—Start, James R., 413 West Sheridan Street.
Hutchinson—Basford, Jessie, 215 East Fourth Street.
Cross, Maude L., 127 First Avenue.
O'Connell, William V., 22 East 14th Street.
Linsborg—Swensson, Annie Theo., 343 North College Street.
Manhattan—Hill, Howard T., Kansas State Agriculture College.
Holcombe, Ray E., Kansas State Agriculture College.
Saffordville—Jones, Martha P.
Salina—Templer, Charles S., 1104 South Santa Fe Street.
Topeka—Bixler, Grace, 1418 Harrison Street.
Hill, Evelyn, Washburn College.
Wichita—McBride, Lida, High School.
Wilner, George D., Fairmount College.
Winfield—Trautwein, Olive.

KENTUCKY

Berea—Raine, James W.
Danville—Williams, Mildred, Kentucky College for Women.

LOUISIANA

Baton Rouge—Adams, J. Q., 542 St. Francis Street.
New Orleans—Ellis, Cora E., 8236 Cohn Street.
Hanley, Ben, Tulane University, Warren Eastern Boy's High School.
Hannan, Irene, 917 Thalia Street.
Lilburn, Wilma, 8140 Elm Street.
Oliveira, Amy, 2300 Joseph Street.
Power, Sue B., 838 Broadway Street.
Shreveport—Cline, Hazel, 1056 Sheridan Avenue.

MAINE

Lewiston—Baird, A. Craig, Bates College.
Woodfords—Welsh, Jeanne C., Deering High School.

MARYLAND

Baltimore—Smith, Bromley, 3021 Huntingdon Avenue.
Frederick—Orr, Ula A., Hood College.

MASSACHUSETTS

Amherst—Garrison, S. L., 125 South Pleasant Street.
Belmont—Robbins, Samuel D., 40 Centre Avenue.
Boston—Dacey, Theresa A., Boston Public Schools.
Connor, Joseph E., Emerson College of Oratory.
Foat, Lorraine, Emerson College of Oratory.
Ross, Harry Seymour, Emerson College of Oratory.
Swift, W. B., Normal School for Speech Education.
Tripp, W. B., 25 Huntington Avenue.
Brookline—Rice, Phidelah, 286 Clark Road.
Cambridge—Winter, I. L., 32 Hubbard Park.
Four Rivers—Hurley, Margaret T., 1335 Robson Street.
Northhampton — Avery, Elizabeth, Smith College.
Sharon—O'Neill, J. Milton.
South Hadley—Ball, Margaret, Mt. Holyoke College.
Couch, Miss I. C., Mt. Holyoke College.
Stinchfield, Sara M., Mt. Holyoke College.
Tufts College—Maynard, Newell C., 72 Professors Row.
Wellesley—Damon, Mrs. Ruth A., Wellesley College.
Hunt, Mrs. Elizabeth, Wellesley College.
Moses, Edith W., Wellesley College.

MICHIGAN

Adrian — Schlegelmilch, Donna, Adrian College.
Albion—Diehl, Dorothy, College Court.
Ewbank, H. L., 419 Cass Avenue.
Gibbs, Ruth, 901 East Cass Street.
Hicks, Gertrude, 709 Perry Street.
Howe, Agnes, 905 South Superior Street.
Ann Arbor—Eich, Louis, University of Michigan.
Hollister, R. D. T., University of Michigan.
Immel, Ray K., University of Michigan.
Layton, Charles R., 439 South Division Street.
Taylor, John Adams, 1206 Washtenaw Avenue.
Trueblood, Thomas C., University of Michigan.
Battle Creek—Hathaway, John H., 338 West Van Buren Street.
Detroit—Cochran, Dana E., 2233 Pennsylvania Avenue.
Crumpton, Claudia E., Hutchins Intermediate School.
Stoddard, Clara B., 3779 Maybury Grand Avenue.
Fremont—Cummings, Gladys, 128 East Main Street.
Grand Rapids—Baxter, E. Ray, 125 Hazen Street.
Trolander, Evelyn N., 119 Jefferson Avenue.
Holland—Nykerk, J. B., Hope College.
Kalamazoo—Campbell, Alice A., State Hospital.
Lahman, Carroll P., 703 West Lovell Street.
Rousseau, Lousene G., Western State Normal.
Shaw, Laura V., Western State Normal.
Lansing—Harvey, Julia L., Central High School.
Newberry—Evans, Mirzanell.
Niles—Platt, Helen M., 710 South Fifth Street.
Plymouth—Huston, Ruth E., 921 Penniman Avenue.
Port Huron—Packard, L. A., High School.
Richmond—Schofield, Lucile.
Saginaw—Miller, Harry G., Central Junior High School.
Stambaugh—Knutzen, Norman E., High School.
Ypsilanti—Lathers, J. Stuart, State Normal College.
McKay, F. B., State Normal College.

MINNESOTA

Aurora—Lindsay, Buena.
Crookston—Wynn, Dale.
Hibbing—Dumke, Emma Charlotte, Junior College.
Mankato — Constance, Margaret, State Teachers' College.
Rackham, Henrietta, 413 Hickory Street.
Minneapolis—Babcock, Bessie, 720 Fourth Street, South.
Blanchette, A. M., 802 Fourth Street.
Brings, Clarence, 60 Eleventh Street, South.
Edwards, Davis, University of Minnesota.
Garns, John S., 806 Necollet Avenue.
Holt, Charles M., Minnesota School of Music, Oratory and Dramatic Art.
Rarig, F. M., University of Minnesota.
Northfield—Cochran, I. M., Carleton College.
Kentzler, Ruth P., Carleton College.
Menchhofer, J. D., St. Olaf College.
Preston—Gray, Mildred E.
Saint Paul—Druch, Mrs. Rae B., 2052 Summit Avenue.
Morton, Marguerite W., 824 Holly Avenue.
Rowles, May V., 1958 Selby Avenue.
Wright, M. L., Hamline University.
South Hibbing—Samuels, Agnes, High School.
Worthington—Grumstad, Pearl E.

MISSISSIPPI

Columbus—Whipple, Mary Margaret, Mississippi State College for Women.
Hattiesburg—Gay, J. C.

MISSOURI

Bigelow—Williams, Nellie.
Boonville — Marston, Frederick, Kemper Military School.

Columbia—Tisdel, Frederick M., University of Missouri.
Kirksville—Wise, C. M., 507 South Davis Street.
Kirkwood—Mendham, Nelly, 220 Way Avenue.
St. Joseph—Frick, Agnes A., Central High School.
St. Louis — Battle, Anita T., 5656 Kingsbury Boulevard.
Dix, Pearl, 4558 Red Bud Avenue.
Forsythe, Irene A., 7522 Forsythe Boulevard.
Grace, Charity, Yeatman High School.
Gregory, Olivia, 3202 Palm Street.
McGinnis, Mildred A., 818 South Kingshighway.

MONTANA

Billings—Garvin, Priscilla, Olive Hotel.
Great Falls—Huhn, Vivian, 104 Jensen Apts.
Livingston—Weston, Nelle C.

NEBRASKA

Omaha — Howes, Margaret, 517 South 58th Street.
Puls, Edwin, 312 Y. M. C. A. Building.
Peru—Williams, Ruth M., State Normal School and Teachers' College.

NEVADA

Reno—Turner, A. E., University of Nevada.
Wells—Berry, Frac.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Hanover—Bradley, Howard A., Dartmouth College.
Brown, F. E., Dartmouth College.
Parrish, W. M., Dartmouth College.
Utterback, William E., Dartmouth College.

NEW JERSEY

Bayonne—Brown, Marguerite L., 38 East 37th Street.
East Orange—Freeman, Alice E., 307 William Street.
Highstown—Reeves, J. Walter, Peddie Institute.
Jersey City—Creasey, Hannah M., 2600 Boulevard.
Cummings, Helene R., 2128 Boulevard.
Ziegener, Augusta A., 405 Fairmount Avenue.
Princeton—Smith, Henry, Princeton Theological Seminary.
Trenton — Kuhn, Effie Georgina, New Jersey State Normal School.

NEW YORK

Alfred—Mix, Mrs. Arlotta B., Alfred University.
Brooklyn—Alt-Muller, Helen K., Parker Collegiate Institute.
Lieberman, Elias, Bushwick High School.
Barker, Sara H., 1208 Pacific Street.
Smith, Eugene, 120 St. Marks Avenue.
Smith, W. Palmer, 401 East 18th Street.
Canton—Miles, Edson R., 49 Park Street.
Carthage—Meredith, Laura M.
Cobleskill—Arnold, Carrie E., 96 E. Main Street.
Cooperstown—Goossen, Mina S., 28 Nelson Avenue.
Freeport—Marean, Maud L., 420 South Ocean Avenue.
Ithaca — Bauer, Marvin, Cornell University.
Caplan, Harry, 25 Goldwin Smith Hall.
Drummond, Alexander, Cornell University.
Hultzen, Lee S., 241 Linden Avenue.
Hunt, Everett Lee, Cornell University.
Muchmore, G. B., Cayuga Heights Road.
Pflaum, George R. R., Cornell University.
Thomas, C. K., Cornell University.
Newburgh—Babbitt, Rev. J. Woodman.
New York—Alviene, C. M., The Alviene Schools, 43 West 72nd Street.
Briggs, C. C. D., New York University.
Brown, May Laird, 1 East 89th Street.
Bullowa, Alma M., 148 East 71st Street.
Casey, Helen M., 189 Claremont Avenue.

Collins, G. Rowland, New York University.
Currie, George J. D., 250 West 51st Street.
Cusack, Annette Lucille, Evander Childs High School.
Daggett, Windsor P., 202 West 74th Street.
DeWitt, Marguerite E., 22 East 17th Street.
Loeb, Elizabeth Vera, 423 West 120th Street.
Milne, Katherine, Prince George Hotel, 28th Street and Fifth Avenue.
Perkins, Dagmar, 2480 Broadway.
Perlman, Minnie, 228 Auduborn Avenue.
Pratt, Elon G., 200 Fifth Avenue.
Prentiss, Henrietta, Hunter College.
Redmond, D. W., College of City of New York.
Schamus, John B., 2493 Valentine Avenue.
Scripture, Mrs. Edward W., 20 Fifth Avenue.
Taylor, Harris, 904 Lexington Avenue.
Thomas, Brother Bonvenure, Manhattan College.
Winans, J. A., 400 West 118th Street.
Youmans, Raymond C., 521 West 122nd Street.

Oneida—Brane, Grace M., Oneida High School.
Oneonta—Phelps, Beulah M., 341 Main Street.
Ossining—Marsland, Cora, 21 Everett Avenue.
Poughkeepsie — Steiner, Gretchen H., Vassar College.
Schenectady—McKean, Horace G., Union College.
Syracuse—Bull, Grace S., School of Oratory, Syracuse University.
Tilroe, H. M., Syracuse University.
Warner—Kennedy, S. L.
White Plains—Jolly, Arthur, White Plains High School.
Yonkers — Hartley, Alice C., 747 Warburton Avenue.

NORTH CAROLINA

Chapel Hill—McKie, George, University of North Carolina.
High Point—Owens, Henry Grady, 316 Morris Street.
Lumberton—Russell, H. K.

NORTH DAKOTA

Bowbells—Libby, C. Muriel.
Grand Forks—Schonberger, E. D., University of North Dakota.
Marion—Sinnott, Bess.

OHIO

Akron—Chapel, Ralph, West High School.
McEnright, Carita, 396 East Market Street.
Parshall, Inez, 50 South Adolph Avenue.
Athens—Cooper, W. H., Ohio University.
Cincinnati—Aldrich, Laura E., East High School.
Van Wye, B. C., University of Cincinnati.
Cleveland—Woodward, Howard S., Western Reserve University.
Columbus—Ketcham, V. A., 199 Webber Road.
Sanford, W. P., Ohio State University.
Wiley, Earl W., 144 Clinton Heights Avenue.
Dayton—Craig, Helen G., 82 Vincent Street.
Leland, Herbert T., 727 Fairview Avenue.
Powell, May, 334 South Brown Street.
Stivers, Grace H., The Calvert.
Wiant, Lucia M., Beckel Hotel.
Delaware—Hunter, R. C., 287 North Washington Street.
Leas, Mrs. Dewitt H., 136 West Winter Street.
Lloyd, M. Pearl, 65 North Franklin Street.
Marshman, J. T., 11 Oak Hill.
Miller, Emerson W., Ohio Wesleyan University.
Swink, R. A.
Hiram—Bunn, Russell G., Hiram College.
Lakewood—Hartzell, A. K., Lakewood High School.
Lorain—Hardy, Ruth M., Lorain High School.
Mansfield—Brown, Frederick W.
Waring, Emma G., 370 Marion Avenue.
Oberlin—Baird, Robert L., 279 Oak Street.

New Concord—McCarty, Leon.
Westerville—Fritz, Charles A.

OKLAHOMA

Deer Creek—Dester, Laura E.
El Reno—Misener, Lena E., 603 South Macomb Street.
Oklahoma City—Miller, Enid.
Okmulgee—Guyer, Marie, 813 North Okmulgee Street.
Tonkawa—Chauncey, F. May.

OREGON

Corvallis—Barnes, Elizabeth M., 135 North 26th Street.
Wells, Earl W., Oregon State College.
Eugene—Thorpe, C. D., University of Oregon.
Helix—Rogers, Loeta.
McMinnville—Varney, G. R., Linfield College.
Monmouth—Godbold, Beth.
Portland—Cooper, Elaine, 830 East Morrison Street.

PENNSYLVANIA

Beaver Falls—McConagha, Mrs. M. Carothers, 3014 College Avenue.
Bethelehem—Luch, Myron J., Lehigh University.
Bellevue—Elizabeth P. Howe, 21 South Euclid Avenue.
Bucks County—Landon, Nadia, George School.
Butler—Wiggins, Marion H., 158 Oak Street.
Bryn Mawr—King, Samuel Arthur, Cartref Cottage.
Nichols, Tirzah L., Corner Elliott and Lancaster.
Bywood—Armstrong, W. H., 7016 Wayne Avenue.
California—Truby, Prudence Mae, South Western State Normal School.
Chester—Barnet, Miriam R., 526 East 14th Street.
Doyle, Martha W., 305 East 22nd Street.
Clairton—Reager, Richard C.
Easton—Illingworth, Robert S., Lafayette College.
Indiana—Sprowls, Edna Lee, Pennsylvania State Normal School.
Lebanen—Shay, Russell L., 315 East Chestnut Street.
Lewisburg—Rassweiler, G. F., Extesion Professor of Dramatics, Bloomsburg State Normal.
Lock Haven—Gabriel, Sara S., Central State Normal.
New Wilmington—Moses, Elbert B., Westminster College.
Philadelphia—Dolman, John, Jr., University of Pennsylvania.
Pittsburgh—Fisher, G. E., 219 Lothrop Street.
Wichelns, Herbert A., 248 North Dithridge Street.
Swarthmore—Hicks, Philip M., Swarthmore College.
Hudson, Hoyt H., Swarthmore College.
Pearson, Paul M., Swarthmore College.
West Chester—Caldwell, Florence M., Darlington Seminary.
Everett, Cora E., State Normal School.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Greenville—Buist, Mrs. Ida Robbins, 1026 Pendleton Street.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Aberdeen—Root, A. R., Northern Normal and Industrial School.
Brookings—McCarty, George, South Dakota State College.
Estelline—Lewis, Alice.
Rapid City—Johnson, Florence.
Vermillion—Lyon, Clarence E., University of South Dakota.

TENNESSEE

Memphis—Gill, Ella, 1072 Meriwether Avenue.
Schloss, Florence, 572 Poplar Avenue.
Nashville—Harris, Albert Mason, Vanderbilt University.
Woolson, Clara B., Fisk University.

TEXAS

Austin—Tomkies, Charles D., University of Texas.
Griscom, Ellwood, Jr., 706 West 32nd Street.
Schumacher, Matthew, St. Edward's College.
Dallas—Baker, Elizabeth, 109 South Denver Street.
Rodgers, Frances G., 3830 Gilbert Avenue.
Denton—Smith, Justina, State College for Women.
Fort Worth—Glenn, Cora Lee, 1723 Fifth Avenue.

Georgetown—Wentz, W. Dwight, 1403 Elm Street.
Huntsville—Francis, W. A., Sam Houston Normal College.
San Antonio—Abbott, Frederick, 420 Martin Street.
San Marcos—Sholts, G. H., S. W. T. Normal.

UTAH

Farmington—Hughes, Mary.
Murray—Norberg, Lester.
Provo—Pardoe, T. Earl, Studio Theatre.
Salt Lake City—Babcock, Maud May, University of Utah.
Houstman, Chauncey, University of Utah.
Maw, Herbert, University of Utah.
Scofield, Martha, 125 Eleventh Street.
Smith, Joseph F., University of Utah.
Saint George—Bryner, Ruby.

VERMONT

Middlebury—Davison, Wilfred E., Middlebury College.

VIRGINIA

Staunton—Mollison, Mrs. Minnie O., School for the Deaf.
University—Paul, C. W., University of Virginia.

WASHINGTON

Eatonville — Goehring, Bernice, Eatonville High School.
Pullman—Daggy, Maynard Lee, Washington State College.
Reeid, N. E., State College of Washington.
Seattle—Grindrod, Ione, 1315 East 47th Street.
Tacoma—Black, Alberta F., Stadium High School.

WEST VIRGINIA

Morgantown—Kay, Wilbur Jones, University of West Virginia.
Moundsville — Patterson, Virginia, 110 Jefferson Avenue.

WISCONSIN

Appleton—Sherman, Margaret S., 500 Walnut Street.
Ashland—Reynolds, Mildred, Ashland High School.
Salisbury, L. H., Northland College.
Augusta—Johnson, Almeda A.
Boscobel—Scheinpflug, Ralph.
Chippewa Falls—Haight, Margaret M., 410 Superior Street.
Green Bay—Yabroff, Bertha, Howe Building.
Hayward—Dexter, Mary.
Kohler—Smith, L. L.
La Crosse—Mashek, Anna M., 1240 Mississippi Avenue.
Madison—Barnes, John, 129 Lathrop Street.
Blanton, Dr. Smiley, 415 Sterling Place.
Elver, Bernice, 617 State Street.
Geneveffa, Sister, 2209 Monroe Street.
Harker, Myra, 415 North Park Avenue.
Johnson, Gertrude, 237 Langdon Street.
Lacy, Mabel V., 115 North Hamilton Avenue.
McCarthy, Margaret M., University of Wisconsin.
Scott, Almere, University of Wisconsin.
Tannewitz, William J., 2344 East Mifflin Street.
Ward, Hallie, 124 Breeze Terrace.
Weaver, A. T., 1915 Keyes Avenue.
Welty, Lucile M., 2321 Rugby Row.
Milwaukee—Anbolt, Mrs. Elizabeth, 738 Murray Avenue.
Dixon, Frances J., 145 Thirteenth Street.
Ingraham, Dora V., 974 Oakland Avenue.
Mills, Katherine J., North Division High School.
North Freedom—Young, Adelbert.
Oshkosh — Bauer, Virginia, 169 Church Street.
Racine—Johnston, Alice, Supervisor Department of Correction of Speech Defects.
Ripon — Bonnell, Margaret, 524 Liberty Street.
Boody, Henry P., Ripon College.
Sheboygan—Lorenz, Jennie, 1530 North Eighth Street.
South Milwaukee — Lindesmith, Emery L., 821 Hawthorne Avenue.
Stevens Point—Burroughs, Leland M., 701 Normal Avenue.

Waukesha—Buehler, Cora, Waukesha High School.
Rankin, May W., 303 East Avenue.
Wausau—Huss, Oliver G., 630 Grant Street.
Welty, Merle A., 813 Franklin Street.
Whitewater—Holcombe, Florence E., State Normal School.

WYOMING

Laramie—Higgins, H. H., University of Wyoming.

NOVA SCOTIA

Halifax—MacFarlane, W. D., King's College.

HAWAII

Honolulu—Appleby, Una, Oahu College.